

have already asked consent. That has been objected to. There are about 180,000 Federal workers. But, again, the Democrats will not agree to bring it up unless we agree to everything they want—take out striker replacement, do not vote on the abortion amendments. In other words, what we will do as the minority, and then we will accept or let you bring it up on the floor.

So we would like to bring it up tonight and be on it all day tomorrow and all day Sunday. By Monday morning, maybe we could have it passed and go to conference and bring it back. That would be 180,000 Americans who could go to work.

We are going to send down to the President now State, Justice, Commerce. VA-HUD will be sent down to the President; Interior appropriations tomorrow. All he has to do is sign those bills, and that will take care of nearly all of the Federal employees. That will leave remaining the District of Columbia bill and Foreign Ops. If we can get an agreement to bring up Labor-HHS, let us pass that tomorrow or Sunday in the Senate.

So if the President is not willing to negotiate the balanced budget except on his terms, and he is not willing to sign the appropriations bills we send him except on his terms and is not willing to let us bring up one of the largest bills with the most Federal employees—Labor-HHS, we have been prepared for the past 2 or 3 months, but it has been objected to by the Democrats.

So I hope the American people understand, if people who are covered by that bill are not working on Monday, why they are not working on Monday.

So, again, I would say to the President of the United States, tell the American people the truth. Do not come on television, Mr. President, and say that we are devastating this and devastating that, because, in fact, you know that in our budget we added back billions of dollars in Medicare and Medicaid and made other real adjustments.

Maybe it is impossible. Maybe we are not going to get anything done.

If that is what the President wants, he ought to just tell us that so we can make alternative plans, pass a very stringent continuing resolution and assume that is all we are going to get done. But in the meantime, we are still working on our side. We are still trying to resolve the differences on the DC appropriations bill and on the foreign operations bill. And I hope that they would be ready for passage, if not today or tomorrow, on Monday.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR,
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 1996

MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. DOLE. In an effort to make some headway on the Labor, HHS bill—we have already had two votes which we have lost on a party-line vote—I move to proceed to H.R. 2127, and I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 2127, the Labor, HHS appropriations bill.

Senators Robert Dole,
Arlen Specter, James
Inhofe, Rick Santorum,
Thad Cochran, Trent
Lott, Strom Thurmond,
Don Nickles, Craig
Thomas, Mitch
O'Connell, Slade Gorton,
Dirk Kempthorne,
Robert F. Bennett, Hank
Brown, Connie Mack,
and Mark Hatfield.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. I would only seek the floor if the majority leader is completed.

Mr. DOLE. I yield the floor.

BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS AND THE
CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I did not have the opportunity to hear all of the comments of the majority leader. Obviously, there are legitimate points of view that are very different as we consider the circumstances we are in right now.

The majority leader said we ought to have the truth about what is happening right now. His version of the truth and mine could not be more different. My version of the truth is—and I think it is shared by virtually every Member on this side of the aisle—it was the Republicans this afternoon who got up and walked out of the room. They were the ones to say, "It's over. We don't want to deal with you any more. You're not acting in good faith."

My version of the truth is that there is absolutely no reason why we should connect the continuing resolution with our effort in the reconciliation bill, none at all. There is absolutely no connection. And the reason why we are going through this charade right now with the appropriations bills is because

they know that we are way overdue in completing these appropriations bills. We should have done them a long time ago.

And I will tell you one of the reasons we are overdue. Because they are putting stuff that does not belong in appropriations business on that bill. What does striker replacement have to do with health and human services? Absolutely nothing. We know that. They know that.

And on so many of these pieces of legislation there is absolutely irrelevant, completely unassociated matters legislatively that have nothing to do with appropriations, and that is the hangup, and they know it. If you want to pass that appropriations bill, we can do it by 6 o'clock, and it is now 5 to 6. We could do it by 6 o'clock if we would sit down in a serious way and take the extraneous things out and begin dealing with it.

That bill is going to be vetoed. We do not have to talk about it a long time. But we are not willing to do that because of those extraneous issues and everybody knows it.

So let us be clear. We do not have to shut the Government down because there is a pick with the President about whether he has been working in good faith or not. There is no reason to tell people one more time that they are out of work for whatever length of time. That is not necessary. We want a clean continuing resolution. We ought to have it tonight. We ought to pass it, and we ought to get serious about negotiations.

Now, we know as well that one of the biggest differences between Republicans and Democrats all through this reconciliation process has been the tax cut. And for whatever reason, the Republicans continue to say that is a nonnegotiable item; that we want to hold on to that tax cut virtually at all cost.

But that is not where we started. Where we started was the Republican insistence that we go to a 7-year balanced budget. The majority leader said it has to be on the President's terms. Well, the President said he had a 10-year balanced budget. And many of us supported the idea of balancing the budget in 10, 7, it does not matter, but the President had 10 years. The President said, "As an indication of my good faith, I will go from 10 to 7."

That is what he said. Now, the President also said we have a very big difference in our projection on what the economy is going to do when we balance the budget than what CBO does. There is a profound difference. CBO is saying that once we go through all the pain, there is really no gain. Once we cut all these programs as deeply as the Republican budget proposes and we balance the budget, interest rates are actually going to go up, unemployment is going to go up, corporate profits are going to go down, overall economic growth is going to do down, but we still think it is a great idea to get out there and balance the budget.

Mr. President, we do not buy that. You cannot tell me after NAFTA and after GATT and after balancing the budget and after doing all the things that we said we were going to do we cannot look forward to a better economic picture than that.

Now, why is it that the Republicans continue to insist on holding to that scenario before we even sit down and talk about our disagreements on policy? I do not know. OMB said it is not that bleak; we ought to be able to look at the next 7 years with a little more optimism than that.

So that is a fundamental disagreement that we ought to be able to work through. We should not just take our papers and walk out of the room saying, "It's over; forget it." That is not how we do things around here. That is a legitimate difference of opinion that ought to be discussed.

And when it comes to the policy questions themselves, we are not prepared to go beyond where we said we were on Medicare and on Medicaid and on education and on taxing working people. We are not prepared to do that as long as the Republican position is tax cuts are sacrosanct, we cannot touch them.

So that is where we are. We thought that after the second proposal any objective person would say we are working in good faith.

That has not happened. I am disappointed. The Republicans have taken their papers and walked out of the room and now have threatened to shut down the Government because they did not get their way.

It does not have to be this way. We can go back in that room. We can discuss and negotiate and get the job done. There is still time. We are willing to do it tonight, tomorrow, Sunday, Monday. It does not matter how long. We are there. We will be there. Call the meeting. Let us get this job done.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate that I have talked to both Senator DOMENICI and Congressman KASICH. There was never any mention of the word "walkout." They suggested if we got serious, we would all come back together. And that is precisely where it is. We are prepared to come back. When the President of the United States gets serious, then we are prepared to come back and start negotiations.

I think most of us made plans to be here all weekend just for that purpose. We thought they were going to start this afternoon. We did start the meeting at 11:30, another meeting at 3 o'clock.

And it seems to me that as I watched events unfold, I think maybe there is a split not on our side. I do not know of any. But I think the Democrats are split. Some want to resolve the problem and some want to go into next

year so there can be an election issue on a balanced budget. Maybe that is a legitimate concern.

We sent a balanced budget to the President. He vetoed it. We spent 10 months, 10 long, hard months putting that together. For the first time in my memory, we sent a balanced budget to put us on a path for a balanced budget by the year 2002 to the President of the United States, and he vetoed it. So he has already vetoed a balanced budget.

And now he says that even though he has vetoed one and wants one—we do not want one, or do we want one? And I would hope that—there is still plenty of time. It is only 6 p.m. Friday. I would hope that the President of the United States would contact those of us who have the responsibility, the leadership, and say, "Let us sit down and try to work this out." If we cannot work it out, let us stop kidding the American people.

You cannot have it both ways, Mr. President. You cannot go out and attack us for trying to save Medicare, which you call a cut, and go back and take a look at Mrs. Clinton testifying on health care: "You are going to need to lower the rate of growth of health care down to 6 or 7 percent," she testified, went before a committee. That is precisely what we are doing. That is what we are doing.

We finally had an accurate reflection of what we are doing on "Nightline" last week. Everybody ought to watch it. They took all the rhetoric and all the politics and wrung it out. And now they told the American people, separate the politics, we are trying to save, preserve Medicare.

And I will say to my friends on the other side, part B Medicare is voluntary. It does not come out of the trust fund. It comes out of general revenues. So the people working in the Senate, anywhere in the Senate, in the kitchen, anywhere, take their tax money and pay premiums for millionaires, multimillionaires. And the President says you cannot charge those millionaires—the Government is paying 68.5 percent—you cannot charge them 31.5 percent. It has got to drop down to 25 percent.

That is the President of the United States who ought to say we are after all these people. He is protecting the people who could pay more. I do not understand it. He wants to keep it at 25 percent so everybody else in America can help pick up the premiums, part B, which is voluntary, for people who can afford to pay a lot more than the people paying the taxes in the first place. Yet he is out rapping us every day, as he just concluded, saying we are trying to devastate Medicare.

It is not true, Mr. President. You know it is not true. So it seems to me that—I just look in the calendar. We have had this appropriations bill on the calendar since September 15, 3 months today, and we have tried twice to take it up. We failed on a party-line vote. I think I counted—somebody counted—

about 160,000, 170,000 people would be able to go to work Monday morning had we passed that bill. But the Democrats—every Democrat opposed us on cloture so we could not get the bill up. So I filed cloture again. It will not get the vote until Monday. So it will be at least 1 day off or 2 days off.

But I want the workers to know, the Federal workers to know, Republicans did not prevent this bill from coming up. This is the big one. This is the big one, as far as Federal employees are concerned.

And maybe we can work out some consent agreement and pass it tonight by consent, go to conference, get it back here tomorrow or Sunday, in time so that the people—if you cannot get a CR—then they can go back to work.

So, Mr. President, let me also state, as I said to my colleagues earlier, a list of the possible remaining items for Senate consideration prior to Christmas. It includes nominations and Executive Calendar items, subpoena for Whitewater, if that is going to be debated or necessary, whatever, the budget negotiation, whatever, continuing resolution, remaining appropriations bills, DOD authorization conference report, other available conference reports, rangeland reform.

This is all assuming that we take up and pass the defense authorization bill on Tuesday, that we can do all these next week and the following week. I have the feeling that there may be a few absentees around here between Christmas and New Years. But it does seem very likely we will be in session, unless we can reach a framework of an agreement by the 22d of December, which appears to me to be fairly remote after what I thought was an indication from the President, 2 days running, that he was serious about it, he was prepared to come back here Friday and was prepared to get involved himself.

I am certainly prepared to get involved myself. I know the Speaker is prepared to get involved. I know the Democratic leader indicated his readiness. And I assume the same is true for Congressman GEPHARDT. We ought to be doing it now—now.

We ought to be doing this away from the press. I like the press. They are great people. But we are not going to negotiate if every 30 minutes each side has a press conference, as we did this afternoon, everybody out putting their spin on it. And now look where we are now. We are nowhere. We are right where we started.

So, hopefully, if we ever do sit down, we will sit down somewhere where we cannot be found, where we can discuss the issues and not what spin we put on it after it fails.

So I am still prepared to meet the President. I am still prepared to work with the President.

The Democratic leader mentioned GATT. He mentioned NAFTA. They would not have passed without Republican support. The President knows

that. Oh, it was fine to cooperate on those things because that is something he wanted. Well, the American people want a balanced budget by a big, big percentage. And we believe that we ought to have some real effort made by the President of the United States.

So one thing I did not add to this would be welfare reform will be up next week, the conference report we will send to the President.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOLE. I will be happy to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I was not present on the floor the last 15 or 20 minutes, but I was in transit, and I seem to have heard something which the Senator kind of corroborates that I heard, that the distinguished minority leader said on the floor of the U.S. Senate—he is here, Senator DASCHLE—that the Republicans broke off negotiations on the balanced budget today. Did I hear that correctly? He said that?

Mr. DOLE. The Senator from South Dakota is here. But I think that is the general feeling I had. And I do not think it is accurate, but that is what the statement was.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, if you would permit me, and the Senator might respond, because I have been reporting to the Senator regularly, the truth of the matter is that the President of the United States and the Democrats sent nothing to the conference. They put nothing on the table. And if they would like me to go through details, I will go through details.

They found \$54 billion worth of savings, I say to my friend from the State of Florida, without turning a stitch. They did not change a single program. They said, "We disagree on economics."

I am not talking about \$54 billion over 7 years, I am talking about it in the last year. They want to balance a budget so they say, "Look, we do not agree that the CBO is right on this and this and this." So they find 54 billion dollars' worth of savings. And they want us to sit there and say, "Hooray. You have really made some changes." No change. Not one thing changed. Not one program altered. And then they say, "Well, look, we think the CBO is wrong on some estimates, so why don't we get the estimates right?"

And \$21 billion. They have not changed a program. They have not had to bite a bullet and have not had to do a thing. That is \$21 billion. I think if you add them up, that is \$75 billion of movement toward a balanced budget in the last year without having to do anything. Is that not a marvelous, marvelous way to fix the budget of the United States? It is as if spending does not really matter.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, is the Senator from New Mexico asking a question at this point?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes. I am still asking the question. I will get to the question very shortly.

Mr. DORGAN. I wonder if the Senator will get to the question.

Mr. DOMENICI. I would appreciate it if the Chair would advise the Senator I am entitled to finish my question. They have had plenty of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader has the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. And he is not objecting at this point. The President had the airwaves across all of America. He talked about what we had in mind. I want the Americans to know and the Senators to know what he had in mind. He had in mind that he could come to a conference and do nothing, offer nothing, change nothing, and then blame us. So that is what they did.

They said, "We found 121 billion dollars' worth of savings." I have just given you \$75 billion of it. "And we have not changed anything. We haven't cut a pea. We haven't reduced spending."

Then we go up and—let me tell you a neat one the President recommended today. If you want to understand the pickle we are in in trying to get a balanced budget for America, they take 23 billion dollars' worth of savings in the last year by saying, "We don't want any tax cuts." Got it? You save \$23 billion. But they say that really is not the case. "We do want the tax cuts. We just want to say, if we are wrong on the economics, we will cancel the tax cut."

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I will not ask for the regular order, but—

Mr. DOMENICI. I will ask my good friend, Senator DOLE, who I have gone through this with regularly: Do you really believe, Senator, when the President of the United States signed a bill, and it says we will have a balanced budget using the Congressional Budget Office economics, and you and I have been asking the President to send us a proposal, do you think that it is a credible proposal to have absolutely no savings, no changes, and say to us, "If you don't sit down and negotiate, somehow you're to blame for this?" Could you give us your view on that?

Mr. DOLE. Well, let me say to the chairman of the Budget Committee, as I have indicated earlier, I am very disappointed because I understood the President—we have had a lot of talks the last few days on a number of issues—he indicated to me he was serious about this, because I asked him on the telephone, "If you're not serious and we're not serious, why are we doing this? Why don't we do something else and go home?"

He indicated he was serious.

I know that was not the final offer. Neither was ours the final offer. But we actually did things in our offer, real things in our offer that made a difference: Put money back into Medicare and Medicaid, more money for discretionary spending, whether it is education, environment, whatever. We thought we were in good faith.

So I say to the Senator from New Mexico, I am disappointed. It seems to

me we had an opportunity. This is now the 15th of December. This year is going to be over before long, and we are probably going to be right here to be able to see it leave.

The question is whether or not we are serious about getting down to business. We ought to be meeting right now. The meeting ought to be going on right now. We ought to be talking about the 82 areas where we have a difference—82 areas, according to White House sources, major areas—plus probably dozens and dozens of others.

So it would take all the energy we could muster between now and the 22d of December to even put together a framework of agreement, which I assume we would have to come back a couple days in January to pass under some expedited procedure.

So I know it is not easy. It is not easy making tough decisions. It is easy doing, as I said, things Darman had not even thought of when he was around. Smoke and mirrors, they used to say in those days. Just save \$54 billion there, but baseline—

Mr. DOMENICI. Fifty-four right there just changing the economics. I say to the leader, did you not tell me to go back to the conference with the Democrats and say we will continue to negotiate, we will be there any hour, any time, provided you make some headway in moving the budget in the direction of making some changes that bring us closer together and bringing us a balanced budget according to the Congressional Budget Office? That is what you told me to do.

Mr. DOLE. In fact, I can say very honestly, we had a discussion after the first session, and the question was whether or not we ought to call the President of the United States by telephone and say, "Mr. President, we can't negotiate with what was sent up here under your name, and if you're not serious, we don't see any reason to go back a second time."

We said, "No, let's go back again." We instructed Congressman KASICH and the Senator from New Mexico, "Go back again. Nobody is blaming us for this not succeeding. Go back again and see if you get some serious statement or effort from Chief of Staff, Mr. Panetta, or somebody else." And that never happened. We did not walk out.

Mr. DOMENICI. No, sir.

Mr. DOLE. As far as I know, I guess everybody left; they had to walk out, but nobody left saying, "This is it; it's over."

Now the President is on all the stations saying, "Oh, well, they broke off talks, broke off talks, cutting education," cutting this, cutting that, same old propaganda that has been used in the past 60 to 90 days.

So we are prepared to do whatever is necessary, and we are prepared to be here tomorrow and Sunday and Monday and all next week trying to pass the Labor-HHS bill, which would put some 100,000 people back to work, 180,000.

The Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator SPECTER, made a unanimous-consent request just 25 minutes ago to bring it up right now, and it was objected to. Not on this side. We have tried since September 15 to bring it up. It has been objected to. We cannot invoke cloture. We have every vote on this side, but not on that side. We do not have 60 Members. So I do not know how—we can bring it up if we agree to everything the Democrats want to do, then, "Oh, we'll bring it up if you take out striker replacement, and you can't have any votes on your amendments or one vote."

To me, that is not the way it ought to be. We are prepared to bring it up right now. They can move to strike striker replacement. We can move to strike some other committee amendments, and then finish the bill. It might take a day or two or three, but it will be completed.

So I want the Federal employees to understand, whatever they may read in the paper or hear on the television from the President of the United States or somebody else putting the White House spin on it, this bill, H.R. 2127, has been on the calendar since September 15. We have attempted to bring it up time after time after time. You would all be working Monday had we completed action on this bill, but it was objected to not once, twice, three times and we could not invoke cloture. We had no problem on the Republican side. All the problems were on the other side.

So if somebody is out there disappointed and in any of the agencies covered by this particular bill, they should understand precisely why it has not passed, why it has not gone to the President. We will take the rap on a couple of the others, as the minority leader indicated. On foreign ops, yes, it is held up on an abortion issue. DC is held up on a scholarship issue. We are trying to resolve that yet tonight. And the others have gone to the President or will go to the President.

So my view is, this is a big one, talking about Federal employees. This is a big one. We have been trying to get it up for 90 days. So I hope the President mentions that the next time he speaks and asks the Democrats to cooperate. Of course, he is for striker replacement and issued an Executive order which we think went beyond his authority. We repealed that in the bill. That is why he objects, that is why Democrats object to our bringing it up.

We are still around. We will be here this evening. We are prepared to reconvene if our colleagues are serious about it. If not, we will do the best we can to try to find some resolution between now and Monday morning.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SNOWE). The Senate minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, there are many people who want to speak, and I do not want to take more

time. Let me respond to a couple of points that were raised.

The distinguished Senator from New Mexico made a great speech. It was just all wrong. All wrong. We will not resolve it on the floor, and we will leave it to others to decide who is right and who is wrong.

This President has now provided not one, not two, but three bona fide offers to sit down and reach a balanced budget. He did it first with his 10-year budget last spring. He did it, second, about 2 weeks ago with yet another effort to bring us to the table in good faith, cutting over \$150 billion in real cuts. And today, whether you accept all of the numbers or not, \$121 billion in more changes than what he offered just last week.

Listen to the language. We were again told tonight that we will convene if we think the Democrats are serious. Madam President, if that does not make my point, I do not know what does. We, frankly, do not think they are serious. We do not think they are willing, really, to bring down this tax cut so we do not have to cut so deeply in Medicare and Medicaid.

And let me just say, I do not know how you describe what happened at the meeting, except to say that before Leon Panetta even had the words out of his mouth, the Republicans had stood up and were working their way out of the room.

Mr. DOMENICI. Were you there? I ask, were you there, Senator? Were you in the room, Senator?

Mr. DASCHLE. What do you do with a case like that—

Mr. DOMENICI. Were you there, Senator?

Mr. LEAHY. Regular order.

Mr. DORGAN. Regular order.

Mr. DASCHLE. I will yield the floor and allow others to speak.

Mr. MACK addressed the Chair.

Mr. DASCHLE. Let me say this. We all know that the most immediate thing we have to do is the continuing resolution. It expires tonight at midnight. We know that.

We know that we are not going to resolve our differences on all these appropriations bills and pass them by midnight. The distinguished majority leader made a point, and he is right: The majority of people support a balanced budget. I think a majority of the people—the vast majority—also want us not to shut the Government down, in spite of our differences.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1410

Mr. DASCHLE. So I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 240, S. 1410, a clean continuing appropriations bill, that the bill be read the third time and passed, as amended, with a date change until December 22, with the language that will permit the expenditure of funds for low-income energy assistance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Madam President, I have objected, and I hope the time will come in the next couple of days where we can do something like this. But we cannot do it now. Obviously, we have made no headway.

I have been in a lot of negotiations around here, and I can tell when they are serious, I can tell when they are not. I can tell when they are posturing, and I can tell when they ought to end. I was not in the room, so I cannot make a judgment on this particular negotiation. But I do know that we made significant changes. I went over every one of the changes for hours and hours yesterday. We talked about the changes in my office with the Speaker and a number of Senators, and they were real and they were genuine and they were serious changes. We sought to address some of the concerns raised by the President and the Democrats in the House and the Senate.

So I just say that I think we made a good-faith effort. It is all about good-faith efforts. We do not believe the President did. Maybe they thought, "We will shoot them a blank the first time, and maybe the second or third time we will put a little something in it." But I think we have already gone beyond that point.

It has been 26 days since we passed the last continuing resolution, and we are supposed to work all this out during that time. Well, nothing has happened, and we are here again. If there is no CR passed by midnight—and I am certain there will not be one passed—certain people will be affected over the weekend. If we do not pass one Sunday evening, a lot more people will be affected Monday morning. It will not be as many as last time because a number of the bills have been signed. The President can reduce the number because State, Justice, Commerce is at the White House, and he can sign that. That will take care of a number of employees if he signs that. HUD-VA is on the way; that will go to the President tomorrow. We will try to finish the DC appropriations sometime over the weekend, and we will try to figure out a way to get Labor-HHS. That would leave Foreign Ops, which we think we may have an agreement on, based on language from the Senator from Colorado, Senator BROWN. That would be it.

There would not be any more debate about a CR, but we would still have—Interior is going down tomorrow, too. That is another one. The President has all kinds of opportunities here to put people to work on Monday, without relying on a CR. He does not need one. That is the point I make.

I might ask, Madam President, since I interrupted the distinguished Senator from Florida, if he could be recognized at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. MACK. Madam President, about 26 days ago, when we were in similar

circumstances, there were negotiations between the White House and the House and the Senate about what to do to solve the impasse. An agreement was reached with a continuing resolution, signed into law by the President of the United States, with language included which said that he committed himself to a balanced budget in the first session of the 104th Congress—a balanced budget scored by CBO.

As the majority leader indicated a moment ago, it has been 26 days, and there has not been one single proposal made by the President of the United States that complies with that commitment. I must tell you that those of us who thought that 26 days ago, that there may have been an opportunity to move forward with a balanced budget proposal, we were hopeful that there would be an opportunity in these last 3½ weeks. In fact, we anticipated that this Friday, today, we would see, for the first time, a true proposal from the President of the United States to balance the budget. The minority leader referred to the number of plans that were sent here by the President of the United States.

I remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, you had an opportunity to vote on one of those plans, and every single one of you, as far as I can recall, turned your backs on the President because you knew it was a phony budget. And every proposal he has sent to us since then has been phony. It has been an absolute positive phony.

We come here this evening with a sense of utter disappointment because we are serious in this effort to balance the budget. We feel like you are playing games with us, you are playing games with the American people, and you are playing games with the future of this country and our children and our grandchildren. And, yes, we are a little bit angry and upset. We feel betrayed.

Let me be real plain about how I feel about this President. The President of the United States has, once again, proven that his commitment to principle is nonexistent. He gave his word; he broke his word. It is a habit he does not seem able to break. It is unfortunate to have to say that, but that is an accurate statement about this President. To imply that the offer made today was a serious offer is an insult to us. To come down here with a proposal that virtually does nothing with respect to making additional reductions in spending is an insult to the Congress of the United States and an insult to the people of this country.

If you look over this proposal, in the year 2002, they put on the table a suggestion that they were going to eliminate the deficit in the seventh year to the tune of \$121 billion. And the reason they came up with that number is because the Congressional Budget Office scored the last proposal that the President sent down here. It was a proposal that he said would balance the budget.

After all, all we are doing is using the Congressional Budget Office, which, if you will recall, in January of 1993, the President of the United States reminded all of us that it was important to use the Congressional Budget Office to evaluate budget plans, because he did not want to be accused of estimating his way out of the problem.

Well, I say again, very plainly, it is pretty obvious to me and pretty obvious, I think, to the American people, that the only thing this President wants to do is estimate his way out of the problem. When you look at the proposal they sent down to us today, out of that \$121 billion, \$54 billion is in economic baseline differences—estimating your way out of the problem. And \$21 billion more, a proposed resolution of scoring differences—estimating your way out of the problem. And then another \$23 billion, which I will say is a tax increase. What it says, in essence, is if you get to the 7th year and you are not in the balanced budget range, then you eliminate the tax cuts he has in his budget, which amounts to \$23 billion. He has, in this proposal, about \$98 billion out of \$121 billion, which is estimating his way out, and the other is raising taxes.

That is an absolute phony proposal. I must say, I admire Senator DOMENICI for his willingness to go back into the meeting for the second time today after this phony piece of paper was put on the table.

Madam President, I agree with the minority leader that we do have legitimate differences. But you do not have the guts to put those legitimate differences on the table. The reason for the last 26 days that you have avoided coming down here and putting a proposal on the table is because you will not tell the American people what you are willing to do. You will not make the tough decisions. You just refuse to put a legitimate offer on the table. And then you have the gall to come to us and tell us that we ought to put another proposal on the table.

So, Madam President, this President of the United States vetoed a balanced budget proposal. It was a proposal that would have balanced the budget, and it was the first time in decades that I know of where a President of the United States received a plan that would balance the budget—and this President vetoed it.

This is the same President who is opposed to the balanced budget amendment. This is the same President who has been opposed to every plan that has been put forward to balance the budget. When he vetoed it, he took on the responsibility of providing a legitimate alternative. He has, in fact, refused to do that. I think it is very, very clear to the American people that, in fact, he has broken his word once again.

I yield the floor.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, I was listening with great interest to the goings on the Senate floor. I have been

involved in all of the meetings that have been held, both the joint meetings with the conferees to try and come up with a role, and I have been involved in many meetings on the Democratic side. In 5 minutes I am going back to another meeting.

We, the Democrats in the House and the Senate, will try once again to come up with something that would get the Government back working again. I bear my share of the responsibility for what I think is the totally ridiculous position we find ourselves in. Grown men and women, here at 6:30 or so on a Friday evening, with the Government ready to shut down in another 5 hours, and we are quibbling. We cannot even get through a continuing resolution just offered by the minority leader to keep the Government going for a few days. They turned that down.

You heard the objection by the majority leader to the Democratic leader's reasonable offer. How could any reasonable person object to keeping the Government going for another 3 or 4 days? I do not think this is the proudest moment in the history of the U.S. Senate. We all have to bear our share of the responsibility for that failure.

When I have been hearing all of these remarks about the President of the United States not being sincere, not making a legitimate offer, Madam President, I will not dignify that kind of talk with a lengthy statement except to say that I do not agree at all with that kind of rhetoric.

I say, Madam President, in conclusion, that if those on the other side of the aisle are suggesting that we get real, then I suggest that they get real by coming up front with what we all know has to be the major "give" to reach a balanced budget in 7 years, and that is the ridiculous, outlandish tax cut that basically affects the wealthiest among us in America, \$245 billion worth that is the centerpiece, I suggest, of the Republican balanced budget amendment.

The main reason that the President of the United States properly vetoed the reconciliation bill which would have allowed that—how anybody on the Republican side of the aisle can in good conscience stand up and criticize us for not being real when they are insisting on the centerpiece of their whole budget, unfortunately which is the \$245 billion tax cut basically weighted to the wealthiest people in the United States of America. Until they come off of that in a realistic fashion, we are not going to bend.

Fortunately, we have the President of the United States on our side with a veto pen. Maybe I should stand corrected, Madam President. I just said they have a \$245 billion tax cut that basically goes to protect the wealthiest among us. I stand corrected. It is \$242 billion, because in all good conscience the Republican conferees came to that meeting today and they agreed to cut \$5 billion—a total of \$5 billion out of a \$245 billion tax break for the wealthiest

among us, and they claim that we are not being reasonable.

I simply say, Madam President, while I am not particularly proud of what is going on in the U.S. Senate tonight, and for the life of me I cannot understand how reasonable people with legitimate differences of opinion on how we reach the balanced budget cannot agree to a continuing resolution to keep the Government running while we continue the frustrating process of trying to come up with a balanced budget.

Madam President, there is no way that the Democrats can, should, or will give up our insistence of at least a measure of protection for the Medicare recipients and the Medicaid recipients. The latter, I point out, is not welfare, it is health care. Most or all of the billions of dollars that we spend in the Medicaid Program, over half of it goes to the senior citizens, the oldest and frailest among us who are lying in beds, many of them never getting out of beds, in our nursing homes.

The Republicans are making draconian cuts in that program. Like it or not, we will not have it. We will not put up with it. We are willing to compromise, but we will not move until they get realistic on eliminating that gross \$242 billion tax cut for the wealthiest among us and the American people know and the American people by a vast majority stand with us, even though we stand in the minority.

I remind all in closing, Madam President, this Senator has been for a balanced budget for a long, long time, worked hard for it. I voted for the Republican constitutional amendment to balance a budget in 7 years. My credentials are pretty hard to argue with. I simply say that I, once again, emphasize that I am not particularly proud of what we are doing on either side of the aisle this Friday night on December 15. I simply say that if you are looking for someone to blame, we Democrats are willing to take our share of the blame when and if the people on the other side of the aisle would get off their kick which is the centerpiece of their budget proposal to throw away \$242 billion in a tax break on the rich while savaging Medicare and Medicaid and other social programs that we think are very important. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Madam President, I have had an opportunity to listen to this whole discourse between the leaders and the chairman and now ranking member of the Budget Committee, and the excellent statement that came before.

Sometimes I wonder what country I am in, how much revisionist history that we are going to be subjected to on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I have come to expect it out of the White House. I turn on the White House now and I expect to hear the latest version of nonreality. It just comes up every day. As the Senator from Florida said, this President just does not know how

to tell the truth anymore. He just makes a promise and breaks it every day. Changes it every day. What is the story today? What does the poll read today? How can I flip-flop again today?

One time he is out criticizing the Republicans for gutting Medicare, and his wife and himself just 2 years prior to this were advocating the exact same reductions in Medicare. I will show you the videotape. The Senator from Kansas, the majority leader, is absolutely right. All of you who can get a chance to watch "Nightline"—this is not exactly a Republican, GOP "Rising Tide" program, this is "Nightline," ABC "Nightline" on December 12—watch it. Get a copy of it. Get the transcript. Find out the truth. Find out the truth.

Mrs. Clinton, in front of a committee I happen to serve on, the Ways and Means Committee, testified she wanted Medicare to grow between 6 and 7 percent. Our program under this bill grows Medicare at over 7 percent each year. And that is a slash? That is destroying? "That is horrible. You hate seniors."

As his press secretary said, "Oh, Republicans want these seniors to die." That is the kind of rhetoric we get out of the White House—the White House, the President of the United States, not some two-bit peddler on the corner trying to hawk his wares, who can make any kind of outrageous statement he wants to, to try to sell the goods. No, the President of the United States, to the American public—bald-faced untruths. Every day. Just like his press conference a little while ago. Not true. Not true.

Is his offer legitimate? Oh, how do you walk into a budget negotiation that you say you are going to live up to what the continuing resolution, the last spending bill, said—and what did he sign into law? He signed into law a balanced budget, that we would balance the budget in 7 years using the Congressional Budget Office numbers—into law. Not another one of his promises on the campaign trail, which he broke, like cutting taxes for the middle class, but signed something into law with a pen—not Lyndon Johnson's pen, maybe it wasn't Lyndon Johnson's pen—but into law.

So, where does he come, the day of the shutdown? He comes into a room with a budget that does not even come close to balancing.

We have had the President's budgets before. In fact, we voted on them on the floor of the Senate. The last one that was supposedly balanced in 10 years—96 to nothing. Not a single Democrat voted for his balanced budget. Another phony, another untruth that even the people on the Democratic side of the aisle could not stomach—this untruth. We are tired of stomaching untruths over here. We are downright getting angry over here. We are not angry because we feel betrayed. I disagree with the Senator from Florida. I do not feel betrayed. I expect it. I predict it. This guy is not going to tell the truth. Just believe that. Go into negotiations believing that.

What I am upset about is I think we are missing an opportunity here to do something good for America. We can balance the budget of the United States. We can improve the economy of this country, create more jobs, lower interest rates, give some of that money back to the American families across this country.

Oh, I know these people who do not need the money, according to many. Oh, you know, these working families making \$30,000 a year who do not need the money, who would waste it if they did not give it to us. We can use it better than they can.

Oh, this is the tax break for the wealthy that we have been hearing about. Let us talk about this tax break for the wealthy. Over 80 percent of the tax break for the wealthy goes to people who earn under \$100,000 a year. That is the tax break for the wealthy—targeted. This is wonderful rhetoric, targeted at the wealthy, primarily the wealthy.

Let me tell you about targeting. Do you know who pays 50 percent, roughly 50 percent of the taxes in this country? The top 5 percent of income earners in this country pay 50 percent of the taxes. So, if you were going to give an across-the-board tax cut based on how much you pay, obviously 50 percent of the benefit will go to the top 5 percent, because they pay 50 percent of the taxes. Yet, in this case, 80 percent of the benefits go to people who pay well under 50 percent of the taxes.

How, is that targeted toward the wealthy? In reality, how can you make the argument, based on those facts—nobody argues those facts, where this money is being allocated, who the tax cuts benefit. How can you stand up on the floor of the Senate and make a factual statement, as the President has done—not on the floor of the Senate but in other places—and many Senators, make the statement that we have tax cuts targeted for the wealthy, when they know that is a lie?

I am using strong terms like "lie," but I do not think anybody understands these other sort of terms: oblique, indirect, you know, not-coming-forward. We have gone beyond that. We are just dealing with some systematic disinformation campaigns that I have not seen in my lifetime.

I can tell you, we have not done a very good job—I will be self-critical of myself and other Members on this side of the aisle and others who are supporting a balanced budget—we have not done a very good job of getting the facts out. In fact, if we do get the facts out, we know we can succeed.

I will refer you to last Thursday's Wall Street Journal. There was a poll of Americans. The question was asked, "Given the fact that under the Republican budget, Medicare spending increases by 45 percent over the next 7 years, do you think that is, A, too much; B, too little; or C, just about right as far as the increase is concerned?"

Madam President, 60 percent of the people said a 45 percent increase in Medicare spending was too much; 38 percent said it was just right; 2 percent thought it was too little. Two percent of the American public as surveyed thought that it was too little of an increase.

Now, with the recent changes that we have just made in our Medicare proposal, Medicare spending goes up at a higher rate than 45 percent. Maybe that would drop to 1 percent of people who think it is too little.

See, we believe that when we get the facts out—not rhetoric, not, “Oh, you are going to hurt this person or that person,” or showing the pictures, those graphic photos about how people are going to sleep on grates, or your grandmother who is not going to be in the nursing home.

We have a responsibility here to deal with the facts. The facts. We have a responsibility here to base our decisions on what is good public policy for today, tomorrow, and the future. We are standing up as Republicans, doing what I believe is a very courageous thing. We are taking on the sacred cows of Washington, DC. We are taking on Medicare and Medicaid and welfare. We are not doing it in a time of severe financial crisis or foreign crisis. We are doing it because we believe it is in the best interests of our children and their children, and people living today to do just that.

I will never forget, as a Member of Congress, reading column after column, expert after expert, people here on this floor and in the House, saying, “When are we going to get statesmen again in this country? When are we going to get people who ignore the polls—who ignore the polls—who ignore the moment, who forget about the next election and think about the next generation? When are we going to get these statesmen here in Washington again?”

They are here. And they are willing to sit down and negotiate. They are willing to get serious about solving problems.

Maybe the White House should take a few days off from polling and quit worrying about what the public is saying tomorrow or the next day and think about what future generations are crying to us to do.

Senator COVERDELL, from Georgia, comes to the floor on a frequent basis and puts up a chart showing how, within 15 years, five programs will consume every dollar of Federal spending. Five programs: Welfare, Medicaid, Federal retirement, Medicare, and Social Security. Those five entitlement programs will consume every Federal dollar, with the exception of payments for interest.

You can trot around here all you want about: You should not touch Medicare. You should not do this. If we do not control the rapid growth of all of these programs, you will not have to worry about Head Start funding. We

will not have to worry about Labor-HHS. There will be no Labor-HHS bill. We will not have to worry about continuing resolutions. We will not have any money to appropriate. We will have all entitlement spending. We can go home. We do not have to pass any bills around here. Everything will be on automatic pilot. We will just spend away.

To suggest by our efforts to reform Medicare and Medicaid that we, somehow, do not care about your grandmother or grandfather in a nursing home or do not care about people who are indigent getting care is the lowest form of demagoguery.

Do you not care about people today and tomorrow? Do you not care about the future? Do you not really care that unless we make changes, these programs are doomed? You can whistle through the graveyard at night all you want, but eventually, folks, we face the music. We must face the music. And when the President of the United States walks in with his negotiators in a budget negotiation today to present an honest budget, he does not even nick either of those programs, Medicare or Medicaid, does not even talk about reforms of either of those programs, when he knows that we have to make fundamental changes.

They did not walk out, but I would not have blamed Senator DOMENICI and Congressman KASICH to walk out. There comes a time in every negotiation when one side just has to call the bluff, and right now the President is bluffing. He has been bluffing for months. He is hiding those cards. He has not shown them to anybody. All he is doing is looking at those cards and telling the American public: Oh, my cards are great. They protect our values. I sometimes quiver at what his values are. But they protect them.

Our cards are all laid out on the table. They are all face up. You can see every one of them. You can see our good cards and you can see our bad cards. You know what we have said? We are willing to negotiate all of those cards. I do not know where the Senator from Nebraska or the Senator from South Dakota are coming from in saying that we are not willing to negotiate the tax cuts. I have not heard one remark from any of the negotiators or any of the leaders or anyone on this floor who said we are not willing to negotiate the tax cuts. We are certainly willing to negotiate the tax cuts.

We have already, as the Senator from Nebraska said—and it may not have been as much as he would like to have seen—we have already changed the tax cut a little bit. We knocked off \$5 billion. But remember, this is money that you work for. You would think around here that a tax cut is money that we have in Washington that we may want to give to you.

Let me remind you that you have to pay it here first. You have to work hard to earn it and then pay it here. We do not have a right to it. This is not a

Government where you say, well, 100 percent of what you own is ours and whatever we are willing to give you back you can keep. That is not the way it works. Over the next 7 years, taxes will increase above the level today by over \$3 trillion. Americans will pay \$3 trillion more in taxes over the next 7 years. What are we suggesting? Well, instead of increasing it \$3 trillion, it will increase a little less than that, about \$240 billion less than that. Boy, what a giveaway. Boy, what a steal here. We are just throwing money out of Washington, are we not? You are going to give us \$3 trillion more and we will give you a couple hundred billion and we will target it specifically.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. That is, \$141 billion of the \$245 billion targeted specifically at middle-income working families.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield as far as time?

Mr. SANTORUM. I yield for a question.

Mrs. BOXER. It has nothing to do with substance, but could I ask the Senator how long he expects to continue?

Mr. SANTORUM. Just a few more minutes. I will be done in 5 more minutes, I would suggest.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. SANTORUM. So we have a tax cut proposal targeted at middle-income working families. I had done a few fundraisers last year when some of our local candidates were running, and there were people out there who expressed to me the same sentiment that I hear from many Members on this side at these fundraising events saying, “We really don’t need these tax cuts.” That is what these people at fundraisers were saying: “Well, we really don’t need these tax cuts.” And my response to them was very simple. “That’s right, you don’t need these tax cuts. But there are millions of working families who do, who can’t afford to be at these fundraisers because they have to feed children on two incomes.”

We want to give them a little break so maybe they do not have to work two jobs. Maybe they can just work one extra job to make ends meet. And we want to reform Medicare so Medicare will be here not just for this generation of seniors but for future generations. It absolutely amazes me how anyone could stand up here and say we are for seniors but we are not for touching Medicare in the face of a report that says it goes bankrupt in 7 years. How can you say that? How can you say you are for seniors?

Mr. FORD. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SANTORUM. I will be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. FORD. What budget has the Senator seen that has not reduced Medicare?

What budget has the Senator seen that does not reduce Medicare?

Mr. SANTORUM. The President’s budget—

Mr. FORD. I just asked the Senator a question.

Mr. SANTORUM. —weakly addresses the issue of Medicare.

Mr. FORD. The budget that was presented reduced it \$89 billion, the first one out of the box.

Mr. SANTORUM. I take my time back.

Mr. FORD. Take it back, but be careful and be accurate.

Mr. SANTORUM. I will be happy to be accurate. The President's budget, I will concede, reduces slightly the growth of Medicare.

Mr. FORD. What about the second offer?

Mr. SANTORUM. But nowhere near the amount needed.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. SANTORUM. Be happy to.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the Senator explain to me how increasing Medicare at the rate of 7 percent is described as a reduction in any budget? I have not seen a single budget anywhere that reduces the level of spending in Medicare. I have only seen a budget that reduces it from proposals. So I would ask the Senator why he uses the term "reduction" when in fact the amount of money being spent goes up each and every year?

Mr. SANTORUM. The Senator caught me in my own inaccuracy, and I apologize for that, and I apologize to my Democrat colleague. I should not use the term "reduction." The Senator is absolutely right. I should fill that in—reduction in the rate of growth of Medicare, because that is all we are doing. We are reducing the rate of growth.

As I said earlier, Medicare increases by over 45 percent over the next 7 years. And so while the President wants to reduce the rate of growth a minimal amount, less, I might add, than his original proposal when he was advocating universal health reform, all of a sudden from one year to the next he has decided that Medicare does not need to be reformed as much as he first thought it would.

Now, I do not know what has led him to that conclusion other than the fact that now we want to do it and he does not.

What he wanted to do before was reduce Medicare so we could get another big Federal program started—universal health care, Government-run health care. He was willing to sacrifice seniors, using his term, sacrifice seniors to fund a big new entitlement program, more health care, Government run, but when it comes to balancing the budget, no, it is not worth that sacrifice then to balance the budget—if that is what it is, a sacrifice.

I guess it is a matter of your priorities. If your priority is to grow the Government, create new entitlements, create new programs, oh, it is worth taking a little bit out of one Government program to fund a brand new one. But if it is about balancing the budget, if it is about helping working Ameri-

cans, if it is about creating a better economy, if it is about giving up some power here in Washington, oh, no. No, that is not a high priority in this administration. What is a high priority is scare tactics. Scare tactics. Oh, no, we are not scaring 25-year-old folks who are getting out of school and ready to take on the world. Oh, we would not scare them because, you know what, you probably cannot scare them. Oh, let us scare our grandmothers. Let us scare the golden. Let us scare the people in nursing homes. Let us scare the people who rely on Federal Government checks. Let us scare those people. They are the most vulnerable. We can get them. Oh, they rely on us. We can get their votes. We can swing their votes. It is pathetic. It is pathetic.

If the Senator from Kentucky is right that the President wants meaningful Medicare reform, well, let us talk about it, do not run around the country, do not run around the country scaring seniors. Let us sit at the table and discuss it, and let us come forward with some real reforms, let us come forward with some movement. We have not seen any movement.

The President's budget remains as it has at the same Medicare figure. Have we seen any changes in Medicare? No. Has he moved? No. Has he moved on Medicaid? No. Has he proposed a balanced budget? No. Why? Why? Maybe that is the fundamental question we sort of have to end with here. Why is it that the President of the United States, who promised—I know that is not necessarily a big thing around here—who promised to balance the budget using honest numbers in 7 years, why has not he put on the table a balanced budget? Why?

Why do you think that is? Do you think it is because that is not possible? No. It is not because it is not possible. We know it is possible. We actually did it in the U.S. Senate. We passed a balanced budget. I give credit, 19 Democrats had a balanced budget, using Congressional Budget Office scoring, so I give them credit. They put forward a balanced budget. I did not agree with its priorities. It might be a good place to start working from.

But why has not the President put forward a balanced budget? I think the answer is pretty simple. Because if he was going to put forward a balanced budget, keeping true to what he said he wanted to do, balance the budget, provide middle-income tax cuts for families, which he said he wanted to—promised during his election. I know that does not mean anything anymore. We do not believe candidates anymore, some more than others, but he said he wanted to do that. He wanted to save Medicare, end welfare as we know it. That was part of his election campaign—end welfare as we know it.

Why could he not come up with that balanced budget? The answer is very simple. If you want to do what the President says he wants to do, he has to make changes to his Medicaid and

Medicare proposal. And if he does that, then he cannot run around the country scaring seniors anymore. I mean, let us cut to the chase here, folks. That is the bottom line.

We all know where the savings have to come from. It is no secret here. If you take Social Security off the table, if you take Federal retirement off the table, and you are going to reform entitlements, where do you get your savings from? Where are you going to get your reforms from? We all know the answer. The President knows the answer.

And why it is he is so reticent to come forward and put it on the table? Because he loses his political cards if he does it.

Mr. DORGAN. Would the Senator yield? I wonder how much time the Senator is going—

Mr. SANTORUM. I was interrupted, and it threw off my train of thought. I will do my best. If I am not continued to be interrupted, I will do my best to close up pretty soon.

Mr. FORD. We would love for you to.

Mr. SANTORUM. I know the Senator from Kentucky would love to have the opportunity to have the floor and say some things. And I do not think we are going to close down shop here any time soon, so I am sure you will have plenty of chances to talk for quite some time.

But the reason that the President has not come forward with a balanced budget is simple—because he does not want to make the hard choices, he does not want to make the politically difficult choices of balancing the budget, he does not want to lead. It is much easier to sit up in the gallery and throw stones at the players.

Oh, it is easy to be a fan. It is easy to be a critic. It is easy to be condescending. It is very hard to get on the field, put the pads on, and hit the line, make the tough choices. The President would rather stay off the field.

Well, unfortunately, when you become President, you have to make some of the tough choices. That is why you get paid the big bucks because you have to make tough choices. And the reason that the Republicans are saying, "Call me when you are ready," is because the President is not ready yet. He has not made the tough choices. And this is not the Senator from Pennsylvania talking, this is just about every major publication in this country who are beginning, slowly beginning, to understand that the President is not playing from the top and dealing from the top of the deck.

It is about promises. And I will conclude with this. No applause necessary. We promised—we promised, those of us elected in 1994 and here in the Senate, and many others who were elected in their elections even prior to 1994, we promised that we would balance this budget. We promised. And I know promises are not thought a lot of down here. In fact, they are just sort of made to get elected. I know that is the common thing. You say things to get elected. Say you are for a balanced budget

and vote against it on the floor; say you are for tax cuts and vote against on it the floor or do not propose it in your bills. But you know what? We promised.

I will tell you a story of a man who was the head of a Bible college in South Carolina, something he always wanted to do. His father started the college, and he always thought of his life's vocation as taking over the college from his father and leading that school. And he did. He did for several years and was terrific at it. Loved his work.

Unfortunately, his wife came down with Alzheimer's. And, as you know, Alzheimer's is a very debilitating disease. Over time she got worse and worse and worse to the point where she needed around-the-clock care. She was completely incapacitated, did not know who anybody was, did not know who he was. And he made the decision to quit his job at the Bible college and give up his vocation.

The members of the board of the Bible college came to him and said, "What are you doing? You are giving up something you have always wanted to do, and you are doing it so well. Look at the number of people you are going out to educate, to spread the Lord's word all throughout the country. And you are giving that up to go home and take care of your wife? She does not even know who you are."

And he said two things. First he said, "She may not know who I am, but I know who she is. And, second, when I married her, I promised till death do us part. And there is something more than a calling from God; it is a promise."

We promised. And we are going to stay here every day, all day if necessary. And yes, we will storm out of rooms and maybe they do not storm out but they should have for the demagoguery that is going on. But we will be here every day ready, willing and able to negotiate because we promised. And I have told the leader I will be here Christmas Day. If we are going to vote on the floor of the Senate to send American men and women to be in tents and around kerosene heaters in Tuzla, then I can be away from my family on the floor of the Senate to save the next generation of Americans.

We will be here. And we will win. The President will eventually understand that our resolve to balance this budget is greater than his to get away with not doing it.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER addressed the Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Madam President.

Before the Senator leaves the floor, I disagree with him on many of the things he said; and on a couple I agree. When he said we need more statesmen in the U.S. Senate and in Government, he is right. We need more statesmen and we need more stateswomen in politics.

But I want to say to my friend that statesmen do not show disrespect to the Office of the Presidency and statesmen do not use the word "lie" on the floor of the Senate. And I think it is very important for the sanctity of this institution that we respect each other and that we respect the Office of the Presidency.

And I have to say that I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will read his remarks in the RECORD and will have an opportunity to go over those remarks.

Perhaps when he reads those remarks, he will understand the difference between making a point in a way that is disrespectful and making a point in a way that is respectful.

I will say to him further that he talks a lot on this floor about children. Children watch us debate. Children need to learn respect, and I hope that he will think about what I have said, and perhaps the next time he comes on to this floor of the U.S. Senate to disagree with the President of the United States, because he happens to believe the President is wrong to stand up against \$270 billion cuts in Medicare and change the nature of Medicaid, he thinks the President is wrong to stand up against tax cuts which, in fact—in fact—benefit the wealthiest among us—as a matter of fact, if you earn over \$350,000 in this Republican budget that they are so proud of, if you earn over \$350,000, you will get back thousands of dollars each and every year. As a matter of fact, over a 10-year period, you will probably get back more than \$80,000 in taxes, and that is why the President is making the Senator from Pennsylvania so angry. That is why the President of the United States is making the majority leader so angry. And that is why the President of the United States caused the Senator from Florida, Senator MACK, to say, "I'm angry."

You know what? That is just fine with me. That is just fine with me. If you are angry because the President is standing up for the people of this country, not the special powerful few, but the people of this country, then go ahead and be angry.

To talk about, as the Senator from Florida, Senator MACK, did that the Democrats have no guts, let us talk about that for a minute. When we started here on the floor of this U.S. Senate talking about the budget of NEWT GINGRICH that was the centerpiece of the Contract With America, we were not popular. We were not popular at all. As a matter of fact, the polls said the Republicans were flying high. But we stood on the floor of the U.S. Senate and we said we will not allow the power of Government to stand behind the wealthiest few and abandon the middle class and the people in nursing homes and the people on Medicare; we will not allow that.

And suddenly, the people in this country woke up, and they heard us and they heard this President. Yes,

they want a balanced budget, and so do we, and we voted for several of them. They agree with us. Yes, they want a balanced budget, but they want a balanced budget that does not hurt the elderly, that does not hurt the middle class, that does not hurt the children, that does not hurt the environment.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. BOXER. I will be happy to do so.

Mr. REID. It is true, is it not, the Republican budget, every one they put forth, raises taxes on anyone making less than \$10,000 a year, which includes the majority of people in America?

Mrs. BOXER. My friend is accurate, a majority of people who earn less than \$10,000 a year are hit with a tax increase in the Republican budget.

Mr. REID. If my friend will just let me again ask another question?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes.

Mr. REID. Anyone in the United States, which includes a majority of the people in America, under the budget proposals we have gotten from Republicans, every one of them, everyone making less than \$10,000 a year, will have a tax increase, is that not right?

Mrs. BOXER. It is true, a majority of those earning under \$10,000 a year will be hit with a tax increase and the tax cuts go to the wealthiest. That is a fact. And as I serve on the Budget Committee, I say to my friend, I tried. We offered amendments that said if there will be any tax breaks or cuts it should be aimed at the middle class, not at the wealthy.

I know that my friend from North Dakota has been wanting to speak, so I am going to sum it up in about 3 more minutes, and I want to make a point. There is no reason to shut this Government down, no reason in the world to shut this Government down. It is childish, it is stamping your feet, it is saying, "I'm taking my books and I'm going home." But more than that, it is selfish, and it is cruel to do it.

I want to talk to you in my remaining moments about a couple of people in California. Ken Takada, a veterans claims examiner in Los Angeles. His job is to make sure veterans receive the health and pension benefits to which they are entitled. If the Government shuts down, Ken will not be there to see that our veterans get what they deserve. Even after the shutdown ends, its effects will be felt for a long time, because while the VA is closed, new files are piled on his desk, lengthening the case backlog that is already too long.

So the veterans will get hurt and the shutdown will hurt Ken. He is not independently wealthy. He lives like most Americans, from paycheck to paycheck. If his pay does not come in, he could default on his student loans.

But when Senator DASCHLE stood here and offered a continuing resolution that was clean that said keep the Government going, let these people go to work, let them do the work they are paid to do, let them have some sense of

security, the Majority Leader DOLE objected.

So let me tell you, my friends, it is an ugly situation here. Senators who will not lose a day's pay—there is no corner on anger in this Chamber, and I know the Presiding Officer and I tried hard to make sure that we sacrificed something when we cannot get our act together and the Government shuts down.

We have a bill that simply says we should be treated like the most adversely affected Federal employee. But, no, the majority leader objects when the Democratic leader says, "Let's keep the Government going just for a few days." And what is the price that Senators and Congressmen and NEWT GINGRICH get to pay? Zero, because NEWT GINGRICH himself has blocked that bill from coming before the House.

It has passed here three separate times. I think it is an utter disgrace, it is despicable. I hope every single person in this country will let Speaker GINGRICH know and call him on the phone 225-0600—it is a 202 area code—and tell him that he does not deserve to get his pay as long as Federal employees are not getting theirs.

Let me just say this. They can put any spin they want on the other side of the aisle. They can do it. But it comes down to the bottom line: This President is not going to allow Medicare, Medicaid, education, or the environment to suffer in order to give a huge tax break to the wealthiest people. That is the issue and they do not like it. They will spin it their way and tell you they are going to save Medicare.

I will ask you to look at NEWT GINGRICH's speech made 2 months ago when he said, "We cannot kill Medicare outright. We are going to let it wither on the vine." Those are his words, not mine.

The majority leader, Senator DOLE, who says they are going to save Medicare—and he bragged about it in a recent speech that when it was brought up in the U.S. Senate and U.S. Congress, he was here to fight against it. So if the American people believe the Republican Party is going to save Medicare, either, first, they do not know their recent history and past history, or, second, they must think that Jack the Ripper is Mother Teresa, because there is no way that this Republican Party, given its history and given this budget, can stand with a straight face and say they are the party that is trying to save Medicare, and, oh, they are the party that is going to make sure the middle class and the poor are brought along. It just is not true.

So there is a lot of anger around here. There is a lot of disappointment around here, and it permeates through this Chamber, but, frankly, it is for different reasons.

I stand with President Clinton in standing up against a budget that would be put in balance at the expense of the American people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BENNETT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, I appreciate the recognition. I say to my friend, I know he has been on his feet. I have been in the Chamber for some time, also. I will not go on as long as my colleague from Pennsylvania, and I assure him he will get an opportunity to respond as quickly as I can make a few points.

I will not use words like "lie." I will not use "despicable" and "disgraceful." I came over here a little bit angry, but I will not use the word "anger." I will do my best to try to analyze what I think is really going on here and hope it might make a modest contribution to the dialog.

I do not believe that anybody is proposing savaging Medicare. That was a phrase that was used earlier on this floor. I am willing to stipulate, for this Senator, right this moment, that I will accept the President's number for Medicare. It happens to mean, in terms of increased premiums—one of the things the President has been most upset about—that I am now sacrificing Federal revenue of 39 cents per day per recipient by going to the President's number.

I know enough about forecasting to know that I am perfectly safe in saying I will take the President's number as to what the premiums will be 7 years from now, because anyone who really thinks we can make a forecast within pennies that is good for 7 years is kidding himself or herself. So I am willing to stipulate that the Medicare debate over numbers is off the table because I am willing to accept the President's numbers as the target numbers rather than the Republican numbers because they are literally pennies apart. There is no point in fighting over it. If that means that I am now redeemed from savaging Medicare, I appreciate the redemption. But what it really means, Madam President, is that the phrase savaging Medicare is a misplaced phrase because the President, himself, has proposed a number that is, as you go over the life of the program, simply pennies away from the number we have been attacked for in these many months.

I would like to talk about the tax cut for the wealthiest among us. One of the most serious problems we face in this country—which we sometimes lose sight of, but occasionally turn to—is the fact that real wages among people who work for salaries and work for wages, who do not have investment income and interest income, have been stagnant for many years. The stagnancy goes back into past administrations. It has not changed under this administration. It is one of the economic problems we face—real wages for what we call ordinary people have been stagnant.

I will confess that I approached the tax cut for children with some concern because I looked at it solely in eco-

nomics terms, and I said to myself that this particular tax cut is not going to increase the rate of growth in the economy, which is the root problem. There are now economic studies that challenge that conclusion that demonstrate that this tax cut will, in fact, stimulate economic growth. But I will leave that debate for another time.

I will simply raise this point. If, in fact, one of our more serious difficulties is stagnant real wages for ordinary people, and it is a fact that—being the father of six children, I know this one—the biggest impact comes upon those who have kids. They have to worry about clothing them and educating them and taking care of them. What could be a better way of attacking that particular economic problem than saying to those ordinary people, who have children, that we will allow you to keep an extra \$500 per year for each one of your children, while we work on this long-term problem of solving our growth difficulties?

The Senator from California was talking about people who are earning \$350,000 a year who are going to get \$100,000 in tax benefits. My reaction is that they are sure going to have an awful lot of kids if they are going to get \$100,000 a year, because the tax break comes at \$500 per child. That is going to require more children than I know of anybody having had to get to the full \$100,000. We are talking about \$500 per child for the man, or the woman, or the couple, who has a child, who is working for wages at \$20,000 or \$30,000 or \$40,000 a year and is having financial problems, because his or her real income has been stagnant for years.

So I have revised my position on the tax cut, as I have looked at it in those terms, and said that this makes sense. It certainly makes a lot more sense than taking that \$500 and bringing it to Washington and spending it on some kind of job retraining program in the hope that you can do something about the stagnant real wages of that wage earner. This is not a tax cut for the rich. The statistics demonstrate it. The demagoguery goes the other way. We need to keep our focus elsewhere.

What is this really all about, Madam President? Why are we facing this kind of a crisis here tonight? Some would summarize it by saying the Republicans are willing to risk shutting down the Government in order to get a balanced budget.

The President is willing to risk shutting down the Government in order to prevent a balanced budget.

I prepared to say that and I decided, no, I better go farther than that; that is too glib a summary. This is what I think this is all about. Let us go back to the 1992 campaign. My friend, Senator DORGAN, who is probably going to be recognized next, and I both ran for the Senate in 1992. So did Bill Clinton run for President in 1992. I do not know what the Senator's campaign slogan was, but I know what mine was. It was change.

I had a little trouble with that because somebody said, "That is Governor Clinton's slogan. He is running on change." The woman elected to the second congressional district in Utah, Karen Shepherd, a Democrat, ran on change. We all got elected. President Clinton got elected on change, I got elected on change, and Karen Shepherd got elected on change, Republicans and Democrats, on the wave was change. Then the President put forth his first serious financial proposal. It was a \$19 billion stimulus package saying we had to stimulate a sluggish economy by spending \$19 billion in an emergency appropriation.

Why do I point that out, Madam President? For this reason: Emergency appropriations do not go through the budget process. Emergency appropriations go directly to the deficit. We have an emergency, we have to bypass the budget process. We stood here on this floor recognizing that the procedure of taking emergency appropriations to bypass the budget and taking care of your political constituency in an emergency appropriations bill was not changed, it was the ultimate example of business as usual in this town.

We Republicans like to say we brilliantly executed a strategy blocking that. As a matter of fact, we stumbled into it. There was not any brilliant strategy. It just kind of happened. Then we discovered something. The American people liked the fact that we blocked the stimulus package which was really business as usual.

So the 1994 election, in my view, turned on this issue and this issue primarily: Which party is really the party of change? The American people had no change—what they wanted. They voted for change in 1992. They felt they did not get it, so they voted for it in 1994.

What are we talking about tonight, Madam President? We are talking about change. We are talking about which party is most dedicated to changing the way the Government works. We are cloaking that debate in conversation about the rate of growth in Medicare, or slashing Medicare if you prefer that rhetoric. We are cloaking that debate in talks about tax cuts for the rich, and then others respond saying it is not for the rich. We can have that debate. What we are really talking about is whether or not the Government is going to fundamentally change the way it does business and the way it keeps its books—the balanced budget amendment, the balanced budget bill, a balanced budget in 7 years.

Let me conclude by telling you Government as usual—and why I think we need change. I have been around this town or observed this town for over 30 years, even though I have been a Senator for only 3 years. I have seen politicians of both parties and of all political stripes—liberals, conservatives, moderates—all stand up and claim their undying allegiance to a balanced budget. When?

It reminds me of the old Wall Street advice by a wise old broker who says, "When somebody asks you about a stock price, give them a number or give them a date but never give them both." Stocks going to double—do not tell them when. Give them a number, give them a date, but never give them both.

That has been Government as usual with balanced budget—Republicans have done it, Ronald Reagan has done it, Democrats have done it, Jimmy Carter did it—give them a number, give them a date, but never give them both. We have to give a date here.

When is the date that the budget will be balanced? It is always in the outyears. That is a phrase that the American people do not understand. The budgeteers tell you outyears means the years out there somewhere in the future. I discovered that outyears means never. The budget is going to be balanced in the outyears. That means never.

What this fight is all about is whether or not we are going to take Government as usual and procedure as usual that promises a balanced budget in the outyears, or whether we will take the first steps this year and in this budget.

President Clinton sent us a budget. It was put on the floor. It was defeated 99 to 0. I hope the people that are guiding the President in these budget negotiations remember that under law he has to send us a budget for fiscal year 1997. His budget for fiscal year 1996 was defeated 99 to 0. He has to send us a budget for fiscal year 1997. If, indeed, what we are proposing is too draconian for fiscal year 1996, and he really does want to get the budget balanced by 1997, he has to be far more draconian in 1997 than the Republicans will be, because we have a head start on him by virtue of what we are willing to undertake in fiscal year 1996. Of course he would prefer 10 years—10 years gives 3 more outyears in which to make his projections.

I think with all the rhetoric that is going on, the real core problem here that is dividing the two parties and that has created the anger and the excitement and the specter of certain portions of the Government being shut down tomorrow is more fundamental than the rhetoric around. It is over the question of where is the Government going, and are we finally going to undertake the hard choices of doing it now rather than giving us the rhetoric of doing it in the outyears.

In conclusion, Madam President, I offer this summary which may be a little irreverent but that I think helps us understand what we are talking about. The Presidency of John F. Kennedy has been summarized in shorthand now by virtue of a comment his wife made after his death when she said his favorite musical was Camelot. She described how she and he would listen to records in the evening as they were falling asleep. They would put a record on it and listen to it, and his favorite musi-

cal was Camelot. She said—referring to the Kennedy Presidency from the language of that musical—"Let the word go forth and let it never be forgot that once there was a place that was known as Camelot." And that name has stuck.

If I may, with I hope appropriate respect, suggest that for this administration, the musical should not be Camelot but Annie because the hit song in Annie is "Tomorrow." "Tomorrow, tomorrow, I love you tomorrow, you're always a day away." I suggest that this debate is about whether or not we attack the difficulty of balancing the budget today or whether we leave it for the outyears—"Tomorrow, tomorrow, always a day away."

I side with those that say tomorrow is never going to come. If we are going to deal with the problems of the balanced budget we must deal with it now. We must deal with it here no matter how difficult and problematic it becomes and how angry it makes us. We must step out to that hard choice and deal with it today instead of waiting for the time that is always a day away.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

(Mr. BENNETT assumed the Chair.)

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have stayed on the floor for some while because I felt a number of things need to be said in this debate, and the longer I stay the more I regretted having stayed, listening to some of the debate.

I must say the Senator from Utah is, I think, one of the most thoughtful Members of this Senate, and I admire him and respect his views. He has, as he usually does, expressed his views with great respect tonight on the floor of the Senate.

I say to him, however, that his use of the song from Annie is probably an appropriate starting point because the implication of the song that is sung in Annie, "Tomorrow, tomorrow," is the postponement. He says that there is not today, there is always the postponement. Actually, the lyrics of that song are "The sun will come up tomorrow," and so on, and it seems to me that that does represent a kind of a difference here.

If your notion is there is only today, we are only dealing with today, I guess you sometimes forget about the tomorrow—the 5-year-old that will be in first grade next year; the kid who is 3 that might get a chance to go to Head Start next year. Really, the difference in priorities among many of us is to look to tomorrow, look to the future, look to what this country is going to be, in 2 years, 5 years 7 years, 10 years, look about what we will do for our children, what we will do when people reach retirement age, what we will do about those who want an education. Yes, it is really about tomorrow. Let us do what we should do today. Let us meet our responsibilities today and also decide to care about tomorrow, to care about our children, to care about our elderly, and to do the right thing.

You will not hear me in discussing our differences use the terms "liar,"

"dishonest," "untruthful." And I must say, having sat and listened, now, this evening, that this, because of the circumstances of this budget debate and the breakdown of the negotiations and the potential of another shutdown of the Government, is not a proud day in the 104th Congress. I am not proud of the debate I have heard here in the Senate over the last couple of hours, with pejorative terms about motives of others.

It seems to me that we can disagree without being disagreeable with each other. We can talk about fundamental policy differences—Medicare, education, agriculture, veterans, Medicaid and so many others—without deciding that because you are on one side or the other of the debate, you are unworthy or you are not able to think or you are not honest. That is not, in my judgment, debate that advances the interests of the Senate or the interests of this country.

I put my hand on a Bible when I was sworn into the U.S. Senate, and it was one of the proudest days of my life. I did not come here to want to create problems. I came here because I wanted to solve problems. I want this country to be better. I have children who are in school. I want life to be better for those children. I want the world to be safer. I want our schools to be better. I want their job opportunities to be broader. That is what I want to participate in.

We might reach those goals in different ways because we have different philosophies, but I expect most of us want the same thing. The question is, why can we not decide to sit down and reason together without the threats and without the language and without the punitive kind of approach that some here would take; to say: In order for me to win I must make you lose?

I want to talk just a little about the pieces to this puzzle, this issue of a Federal budget. We talk a lot about numbers, and it is true it is a puzzle with pieces that deal with numbers. The question is, How do you make them all fit together? The numbers all represent investments or expenditures for one reason or another. We do not often enough talk about what it is this country has tried to do.

I was on a radio program some while ago. Someone asked me of my heritage, and I explained about my great grandmother Caroline who, with six children, after her husband died, left Saint Paul, MN, and took her children to the prairies of Hettinger County, ND, and pitched a tent. This woman, born in Norway, whose husband died, went to Hettinger County, ND, to pitch a tent, build a house, and build a farm, and raise her kids.

Someone called the radio show and said, "I wonder what she would have done had there been a welfare program back at the turn of the century? Would she not have been enticed, probably, just to go on welfare?"

I said, Who do you think gave her the 160 acres of land? What do you think

the Homestead Act was? Do you think that was the largesse of Chase Manhattan Bank? Do you think it was the Rockefeller Trust that said, "Here, if you will do this, we will provide you 160 acres of land"? No. It was the Federal Government. It was the Homestead Program that said, "Here is an incentive for you to do the right thing."

And this sturdy Norwegian woman—Lord only knows the courage it must have taken to take her children and go to the prairies of North Dakota and pitch a tent and start a farm by herself. This sturdy woman said, "I am going to do that." But it was the Homestead Act that helped her do that as well.

I am proud of a lot of those things. I am enormously proud that we decided to have an REA program that lights up the farms in America. I am proud of the fact that we have a Medicare Program. Over half the senior citizens of this country 35 years ago had no health care at all. Mr. President, 99 percent of them are covered for health care these days. I am proud of that. If someone stands up here and says, "Why don't you decide to start defending these things?" To put us—I am not defensive about it. I am proud of what we have done. We have made this a better country because of it.

Do we have to balance the books in this country? Do we have to balance the budget? Of course we do. That is not at odds. Of course we must. The question is how do we do that? How do we do it in the right way that serves this country's interests?

I come to this floor and I hear people stand up all the time and they point a finger at somebody and say, "You, you are the one. You are the big spender. You are the obstacle. You never want to cut spending."

The Presiding Officer knows what the business of the Senate is tonight. The business of the Senate is the Defense authorization bill, that is what is on the floor right now. Let us talk just for a second about some of the facts.

You know, you spend money not in some aggregate, hypothetical scheme called a budget debate; you spend money by authorizing it in a Defense authorization bill and an appropriations bill. I just want to show, for those who are interested, what is on the floor tonight: A Defense authorization bill. Mr. President, \$7 billion was added to this bill beyond what the Air Force, the Army, the Marines and the Navy said they wanted or needed to defend this country. They said, here is what we need. Here is what we ask you for. Here are the trucks, the ships, the planes, the submarines we need to defend our country.

And then this Congress, this body says, General, Admiral, Mr. Secretary—you are wrong about that. You need \$7 billion more. You need 17 more T-39 jet trainers. And we insist you buy them. You need six EA strike aircraft. You need an LHD-7 amphibious ship

that costs \$1.3 billion, and you need another ship. You did not ask for them, but you also need a second amphibious ship for \$900 million. You need six more F-15's that you did not ask for. You need six more F-16 jet fighters that you did not want and we insist you buy them. We want, we insist you order three C-130 cargo aircraft. B-2 bombers? We think you are wrong when you say you do not want B-2 bombers. We want you to buy 20 of them, at \$35 billion.

Star wars? We insist you buy it. We increase 100 percent of the funding for star wars, and we demand you begin to build it in 1999. By the way, we want multiple sites and we want it to be space-based.

I could go on at some length. This is a long list of what people who say they want to balance the budget have decided they want to add to this bill. After all, this is a specific bill. This is where you really begin to balance the budget, in day-to-day individual decisions.

In fact, when this bill came to the floor of the Senate, do you know there was a little provision tucked away in it calling to spend \$60 million for blimps? Yes, blimps. I went on a short scavenger hunt, asking who would want to buy blimps in the defense budget? Could someone tell me who the blimp is for? Will there be a name on the blimp? Will that identify the author? There were no hearings—\$60 million for blimps.

My point is this: The next time someone stands up and points at someone else and says, "You are the big spender," I ask them how did you feel about this? Do you want to balance the budget? Let us start with the first step right now, 10 minutes to 8, let us decide we do not need B-2 bombers the Air Force says it does not want. Let us decide we should not build a star wars program the Secretary of Defense says is unwise to build at this point. This is where budget cutting starts. This is where balancing the budget starts. And the fact is, the folks who are here busting their buttons, bellowing, often the loudest—not everybody bellows, but there are some bellows—bellowing the loudest about they are the ones who would solve America's problems and balance the budget, are the very ones who come to the floor with this set of priorities.

The Treasury Department did a story about the numbers that I think makes it pretty clear. It says, picture it this way: Spending and taxing priorities in the budget that has been offered and that the President vetoed, take a roomful of people—my hometown was 400 people—a roomful of 400 people. Get them all in the room, and you have a community meeting. You say to them: Here is the way we divide this up in this approach to balancing the budget. We want the 20 percent of you in this room who have the lowest incomes to move all your chairs to this side of the room. And so you get the 20 percent

with the lowest income moved over to this side of the room. And we say: We have news for you. We have to cut the budget. We just have to tighten our belts. We have to cut back. You 20 percent with the lowest incomes, you get 80 percent of the burden of the spending cuts in the budget.

Now, we know that is bad news, so we do not want the entire room to be filled with bad news. We do have some good news. We would like the 20 percent with the highest incomes in this room to move their chairs over to this side of the room, and they do. So the 20 percent with the highest incomes are all sitting on this side of the room. We say: Now, we have some good news for you. You 20 percent with the highest incomes get 80 percent of the tax benefits in this bill.

And that is the problem with the priorities.

I am not here to point fingers but neither am I willing to allow people to stand in the Chamber of the Senate and say it is the Democrats that have misrepresented what the majority party has done.

I wish to hold up a chart that I held up before. It is Kevin Phillips, whom all of you know, a noted author. He is a Republican political analyst. He has been a Republican all of his life. And here is what he says about it. Not me, a Republican, Kevin Phillips, has written:

Spending on Government programs—

He is speaking about the reconciliation bill to balance the budget that the President said was unfair and he vetoed it.

from Medicare and education to home heating oil assistance is to be reduced in ways that principally burden the poor and the middle class, while simultaneously taxes are to be cut in ways that predominantly benefit the top one or two percent of Americans.

That is not me saying that. This is the writing of a Republican political analyst. And frankly, he is right and that is the problem with the priorities. We can do better than that. We can do better than that. The common interest of Republicans and Democrats in the Congress to come together and compromise can produce a result that is more fair to the American people.

We, I think, should solve this problem. There is no reason for there to be a shutdown of Government services tonight. That is a failure by any standard, a failure shared, in my judgment, by both political parties. I do not deny that. But there is not any reason that we ought not have negotiations that reach a result which is good for the future of this country.

Tomorrow, tomorrow, the sun will come up tomorrow. There is a tomorrow. There are people who will experience the joys of being an American tomorrow, hopefully benefit from the fruits of what being an American is—going to good schools, having a nutritious lunch for a low-income child in the middle of the day at a school lunch program or for a 4-year old to be able

to show up with hope in their heart because we have a Head Start Program that says you come from a troubled family and you come from circumstances that you were not selecting when you were born; you did not select to be born into poverty, but we are going to give you a head start. We are going to give a head start in life.

I saw 60 of them out here in the Capitol this morning; a group of 60 Head Start kids came in with parents and teachers, and I stopped and talked to them because I love the Head Start Program. It works. We know it works. It works well. It invests in young kids. It invests in the future. And we are saying with the priorities in this Congress that we want to increase star wars by 100 percent; we want to increase the funding for star wars by 100 percent, but we want to say to 55,000 kids, each one of whom has a name and hope in their heart for a better day tomorrow, we do not have room for you in the Head Start Program; we cannot afford you. You have to be told you are going to have to leave the Head Start Program. I am just saying to you that is not the right set of priorities.

Let me in just a final moment come to a specific piece that was raised by others because I think, to be fair to the President, we need to have the agreement that was entered into some 2½ weeks ago put in the RECORD, and I am going to read it because no one who has referenced this agreement has read it out loud. This is a CR commitment to a 7-year balanced budget.

The President and Congress shall enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002 as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office. The President and the Congress agree that the balanced budget must protect future generations, ensure Medicare solvency, reform welfare, provide adequate funding for Medicaid, education, agriculture, national defense, veterans and the environment.

Further, the balanced budget shall adopt tax policies to help working families and to stimulate future economic growth.

B. The balanced budget agreement shall be estimated by the Congressional Budget Office based on its most recent current economic and technical assumptions following a thorough consultation and review with the Office of Management and Budget and other Government and private experts.

The balanced budget agreement shall be estimated by the Congressional Budget Office. The President has agreed to that. I agree to that. I believe it should be so. But there is nowhere in this document that suggests that the discussions at this point in the process can or will be scored by CBO because the fact is CBO still has not scored the options that are laying on the table. So you work from a series of options to get to an end point where you reach agreement and that will be scored by the Congressional Budget Office. The President agreed that that is what it will be. But it also is an acknowledgement that it be scored by the Congressional Budget Office after consulting with OMB and other Gov-

ernment and private experts on economic growth, and so on, and also that it will relate to the priorities—Medicare, Medicaid, and others. And those are very important elements. I think to the extent that I have heard this discussed tonight in the Chamber of the Senate it has not been related the way it was just read by me.

And so there is a lot to talk here with respect to what we are doing and where we are. We need to reach an end point, not with games but with honest budgets that deal with priorities that are right for this country's future. Will Rogers once told a story that I thought was interesting. He talked about what his daddy said to him about how to succeed in life. Will said his dad told him to buy stock and then hold it till it goes up and then sell it. And he says, "If it doesn't go up, don't buy it."

I thought about it. That is pretty interesting advice, right? There is a lot of that kind of mechanical description of dealings here in the Congress, the so-called guarantees. We see from the majority side interests that they have, legitimate interests. I understand them with respect to balancing the budget. They say to us we want a \$250 billion tax cut.

Personally, I think there ought not be a tax cut until the budget is balanced. I think we ought to put it aside and say, let us do the heavy lifting first. Let us honestly balance the budget. When we are done with that, then let us turn to the Tax Code and hopefully cut taxes for middle American families. But the majority party says, no, that is a priority. It is a legitimate thing. I understand that that is their priority. They came to the negotiating table today and said, OK, we have changed our position on tax cuts. We said roughly \$245 billion. We are going to come down from that \$5 billion.

It seems to me that is not very much movement in terms of negotiating a compromise. The tax cut includes, some will say—and I expect Senators who will speak afterwards will say—a \$500 cut for children, knowing, of course, that nearly half of the children in this country will not get any benefit or full benefit of the \$500 because they come from poor families and this is not refundable. So a lot of kids are left out of this, of course. But there are a couple other things that are in there that I will not expect anybody to stand up and support tonight because I think they do not want people to understand what is sort of slipped under there just below the surface of the water that nobody really should see. Let me give you an example.

A cut in the alternative minimum tax for the largest corporations in the country that will mean each of 2,000 corporations will receive a \$7 million tax reduction. It seems to me when you are short of money for Head Start but you say "I have money to give 2,000 corporations \$7 million each in tax reductions" is not a right priority.

Another little one, a tiny little issue that I bet no one knows who stuck in—

in fact, about 3 days ago, I asked if anyone in the Senate knew who stuck this provision in. Would they please identify themselves so we could debate the wisdom of it. It is a little provision. I think it is called 956A. I am not sure I have the right number on it, but it is a little provision that makes it more attractive to close your manufacturing plant in the United States and move it overseas.

It deals with investment in passive assets on overseas income that would otherwise be repatriated to the United States. In short, it says, let us make it more attractive to move American jobs overseas. And \$244 million is lost by increasing the tax break to corporations who would move their jobs overseas.

I want to know who in this Chamber thinks it is a good idea for us in this bill to decide, or that we ought to encourage even more the movement of American jobs overseas? Anyone? Three days have passed since I asked who wrote it, and no one has been willing to claim credit. It is only \$244 million. That is only a quarter of a billion. And some people think that is probably not relevant. But when you come from a town of 400 people, we are talking pretty big money when you talk about \$244 million.

I would like to find out who did that, and why, and how do they stand up and claim that one side does not bargain in good faith, but we have a plan that says let us help move jobs overseas, let us help move American jobs out of America. And we are upset that the President vetoed that?

See, I mean, the Senator from Utah, who I have indicated is a thoughtful legislator, I think, said it right. This is not a case where one side is all right and the other side is all wrong. I would like to get to the point where we could recognize there are good ideas on both sides of the political aisle. Let us try to collect the best of both rather than get the worst of each.

Again, I think all of these things we will debate in the coming days again. But my hope is that reasonable people can decide that we ought not shut down the Government tonight. Why should we make the American people pay the price? And that is who will pay the price of the shutdown—furloughed workers will get paid though they will not work—the American people will pay the price of failure here in Congress.

So there is no reason that there ought to be a shutdown of the Government tonight. Those who think they want to let this Government shut down do no service to the American people, in my judgment. And I would say to the majority leader and the minority leader and everyone involved in this—and I have been one of the negotiators for 2½ weeks—we have not, frankly, negotiated very much because people did not want to sit down and go through this.

We should. It is time, I say to all of them, it is time right now. Start on

page one and go through it. Let us reach agreement and compromise, balance the budget, do it the right way, protect the right priorities and solve this country's problems.

President Clinton has a veto, and he used it because he said some things are important. We are going to stand and fight for some things. Elderly people who live with very little income and rely on Medicare do not deserve to pay more and get less health care. We want to protect that program. It does not mean there cannot be some cuts. There will be some cuts, but we do not believe you ought to have a quarter of a trillion dollar tax cut in order to make room for the cut in Medicare by a quarter of a trillion dollars. That is not fair. It is not balanced. And it is not the right thing to do.

There is a better way to do it, and I think that reasonable people could sit down and in a very reasonably—I should not say very reasonably—in a short period of time come to a reasonable compromise that protects some of these things that are important for the future of this country.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has been extraordinarily patient. I apologize for the length, but I appreciate having the opportunity to address some of these issues on the floor of the Senate. I yield the floor.

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, first of all, I would like to thank the Senator from North Dakota for his remarks. I think they very correctly set the tone, the tone that should have been established out here this evening, not the tone that we were treated to earlier in the evening.

These remarks are not directed at the Chair. In fact, the Chair, the Senator from Utah, I thought very politely and effectively made an analogy to a musical, "Annie," and brought the debate back to an exchange of respect in an attempt to point out the differences we have. What I heard earlier on the floor was just rank partisanship. It was very extreme. It was very harsh. It was very personal toward the President of the United States.

When it comes to voting, I think people should do whatever they can to vote their principles, as a rule. Of course, there is such a thing as party loyalty, but you should vote your principles as much as possible. I think the thing that frustrates the American people more than any issue is their belief that this institution is just loaded with partisanship.

You know what I tell them, Mr. President? I tell them that actually the U.S. Senate is not as partisan as it looks on television, that the interpersonal exchanges when the TV cameras are not on are really very civil, most of the time, and that they would be proud of it.

But I think we went over that line tonight, and it troubles me because re-

cently on a couple of occasions I have parted company with my President and my party and voted with the majority party here. This week I was the only Democrat Member of the Senate to vote against my President on the Bosnia action. I voted with mostly Republicans, because I do not think you should just use partisan consideration when you are doing something as significant as sending American men and women to a very dangerous situation in Bosnia.

And more than that, on the issue before us tonight, the budget issue, I was one of only seven Democrats to say, when the Republicans proposed that the budget be balanced within 7 years, I voted, yes, that sounds reasonable. I disagree with the way the Republicans want to do it, but I thought it was reasonable to continue the Government with the agreement that we should balance it within 7 years according to Congressional Budget Office numbers.

So I have been giving the Democrat President some heartache lately. I am sure I am not No. 1 on his Hit Parade, as some people say back home. And I regret it when I have to disagree with him.

But I am very troubled by the personal attacks I heard on the floor tonight toward the President. I remember when I was a young teenager, the Vietnam war was on. My father and I had a strong disagreement about whether the Democratic President, President Johnson, was doing the right thing in Vietnam, and I said some things that were intemperate about the President. My dad said to me, "Remember, at any one time you only have one President." And I have always remembered that as a basic statement about the responsibility of every American, and especially the Members of this body, about the personal way in which you refer to the President of the United States.

The comments that he cannot keep a promise, and the other references seem to me undignified for this great body. In fact, I find it particularly odd that he would be criticized for not keeping a promise when in fact the very issues now that he is being asked to compromise on require him to move away from positions he has taken.

The Senator from Pennsylvania said that the President promised a tax cut, middle-class tax cut, but he broke his promise. In fact, what the majority party is asking for is not simply a middle-class tax cut, but a tax cut that is heavily skewed toward the middle class, but toward upper income people. So, in effect, he is being criticized for not keeping his promises and at the same time being told to break that promise and spend the money even more so on folks who make more.

The fact is that this President is a doer. You may not like everything he is trying to do; he may change his mind sometimes and try one thing and then try another, but he is not a do nothing. He is a doer. And the people in

my State are pretty positive toward him because they think more than anything else he is trying to solve the problems of this country. So let me put a word in of respect and admiration for that President who I have been forced, out of principle, to disagree with in the last 2 weeks.

I do think some of the points that the Members of the other party made tonight about whether we should use Office of Management and Budget or CBO numbers are important issues. But those can be resolved. I think the American people should know tonight what the real roadblock is here on this budget. There is a real roadblock. And if we are going to have a Government shutdown in less than 4 hours, there is a reason why the Government will shut down. It is the same reason why we had the first shutdown. It is the reason we are going to have this shutdown. It is because there is one priority of the majority party here over everything else, one thing that is more important to them than anything else. It is what the Speaker of the other House has called the crown jewel of the Republican contract.

Now, you may think, given all the rhetoric of the last few weeks, that crown jewel of the Republican contract would have been balancing the budget. But it is not. That is not the crown jewel of the Republican contract. Guess again. You may think it was passing the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. That is not what has been referred to as the crown jewel of the Republican contract.

Maybe you would have thought it was the flag burning amendment. Given the rhetoric this week on the floor of the Senate about that, you would have thought that would be what had been identified as the crown jewel of the Republican contract. But it was not.

How about the line-item veto? If I had to pick something that was really popular out there in the 1994 elections, and I think was, in fact, one of the issues that drove the Republican victory, it was the desire to give the President the line-item veto.

That cannot be the crown jewel, and I will tell you why. Because the House passed the line-item veto in February and we passed it in March in the Senate and guess what, the Republican leadership of this institution has not seen fit to resolve the differences and send it down to the President. They are just sitting on it. This President could have that line-item veto today and be vetoing stuff that he does not believe in. But that, obviously, is not the crown jewel of the Republican contract.

The crown jewel is a tax cut. The crown jewel is a \$245 billion—I guess it is now down to \$242 billion—tax cut, 50 percent of which would go to people who make over \$100,000 a year. That is the most important priority. Of course, it is completely and directly inconsistent with the priority of trying to bal-

ance the budget, which many of the Senators who spoke on the floor tonight would suggest is the real issue here.

The Senator from Pennsylvania said this party, the Democratic Party, does not care about future generations. Does anyone believe that this tax cut is going to future generations? They talk about the \$500 per family per kid tax cut. Obviously, as the Senator from North Dakota pointed out, it does not even go to all the families.

This is not going into some kid's bank account. This is not going into a trust fund for their education. I hope the kids back home know that some people are trying to suggest that they are going to get that \$500 and they get to spend it or their children get to spend it. It is not for that. The parents can take it and spend it on important family needs, but, if they want, they could go spend it at the casino. This debate isn't about money going to the kids and the grandchildren. It is about a tax cut. Of course, we all would like to be able to vote for a tax cut. Everyone would like to have a tax cut. If the money was not needed here to balance the budget, it would be a great idea, but it is not.

What it really is is an obsession. The majority party here has an obsession with wanting a tax cut at a time when it obviously makes absolutely no sense.

Just before Christmas, it reminds me a little bit of the way they used to do things in the State to the south of us in Chicago. It used to be tradition to hand out a turkey to everybody in the wards, to make sure everybody got a little something around Christmastime to remember who was running the show.

How in the world can handing out a tax cut at this difficult time when we are talking about Medicare cuts and Medicaid cuts and student loan cuts and veterans cuts and agriculture cuts, how can it be a priority to hand out tax cuts, 50 percent of which go to people who make over \$100,000 a year?

How do we get to this point? It has taken about a year. The election was held a year ago November 8. The Contract With America called for this tax cut. But I believe that the top priority had to be, given the mood of the electorate and the rhetoric on the floor during the balanced budget debate, that we have to balance the budget first before we have a tax cut. But that is just the opposite of what is being proposed here. This tax cut would go into effect right away, right as the 7-year plan would begin.

I have tried, I was the first Member of the entire U.S. Congress, almost a year ago today, to come out and say we just cannot afford this tax cut. And there are many other Members on the other side of the aisle who have told me personally they do not believe we can afford the tax cut. In fact, at one point, one of them was cosponsoring an amendment with me to eliminate the tax cut. He came over to me and said,

"I'm sorry, I can't stick with you on this anymore. We need our party discipline."

The party discipline of the majority party here requires that this tax cut be delivered now, even though it flies directly in the face of the presumably principal goal of both parties, which is balancing the budget.

So, Mr. President, the fact is, we can have a balanced budget by the year 2002 without a great deal of difficulty. We can have it today, Mr. President, not tomorrow, as the song from "Annie" suggests.

We can have a balanced budget by the year 2002 without going to the extent of a \$270 billion Medicare cut.

We can have a balanced budget by the year 2002 without \$170 billion in Medicaid cuts.

We can have a balanced budget by the year 2002 without \$10 billion taken out of student loans.

We can have a balanced budget by the year 2002 without \$8 billion taken out of veterans programs, including health programs.

Mr. President, we can have a balanced budget on or before the year 2002 without shutting down the Government in a few hours. We can have a balanced budget without this acrimony. We can have a balanced budget without this partisanship, but it requires the elimination of this obsession with delivering a tax cut at the same time that you are trying to move right in the opposite direction and when those dollars are needed to balance the budget.

I have the good fortune of having a few more words from the song I quoted. The words, I am told, are:

When I'm stuck with a day that's gray and lonely, I just stick out my chin and grin and say, The Sun will come out tomorrow, bet your bottom dollar.

That is the question. What will we do with our bottom dollar? Will the bottom dollar be used to balance the budget, or will that same dollar be used to give a tax cut to upper-income people? That is the choice before us, and until the people on both sides drop the tax cut, we cannot use that bottom dollar to achieve what I believe is the shared goal here: Balancing the budget by the year 2002.

Let me conclude, Mr. President, by saying that we can also have a balanced budget without such rancor and without such disrespect for the Chief Executive of this country.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I know we can be sitting here and listening and what we are going to hear, I am afraid, starting tonight, which we already heard and probably will for the next couple of days, is a lot of excuses, excuses of why this Government is going to shut down, as I know Senators before me have pointed out, at midnight tonight. Why is this going to happen?

The basic reason, and what we keep hearing is people just want to change the focus, change the direction, put the blame somewhere else, excuse after excuse of why we cannot reach a balanced budget.

The fact of the matter is, the President has not come to the table with a balanced budget. And in fact, the Democratic Party has not come to the table with a balanced budget scored by CBO to balance in 7 years.

The President's budgets have been on the floor of this Senate debated twice—Clinton I, Clinton II. It is too bad we have to start putting numbers to this. Clinton I, Clinton II have been offered on the floor. Not one Democrat voted for it. In fact, it was zero in favor, 99 against.

The budget that was delivered again today that was supposed to be the latest good-faith effort by this administration, called Clinton III, is about the same as what we saw in Clinton I and II, and yet I still cannot, for the life of me, figure out how we can have Senators stand on the floor tonight and defend the budget that they have failed two times previously to even take a vote for.

Now, they talked about \$245 billion in tax cuts. Somehow Americans do not deserve to keep some of their own money—money that they get up early in the morning to earn. If you are in my home State of Minnesota, you get up when it is 21 below zero, get out in the cold car and drive to your job, 7 days a week, 5 days a week, 6 days a week, and you make \$300, \$400, and the Government wants more of it. And somehow, Senators sitting in a warm Chamber here in Washington, DC, somehow do not believe they should be able to keep it.

It was not very hard for these same Senators, in 1993, to vote to increase your taxes by \$265 billion—the largest tax increase in history. That was easy for them because they are compassionate with your money—not theirs, your money, the money you get up every day and work hard for and want to provide for your children, your family. But, somehow, they have first dibs, first claim on the money, somehow, that you are out working for. What they want to do is bring it to Washington so they can be compassionate and somehow give it back to you—\$245 billion. Then they say, well, if we do not give you this tax cut, we can balance this budget in 7 years without the pain.

I would like to ask taxpayers to look at it in this light: If we do not provide the \$245 billion in tax reduction over the next 7 years, where is that money going to go? I have not heard one person on the floor say that if we do not provide this tax cut, we will balance the budget faster. It will still be 7 years. In that respect, what are they saying? They are saying Congress can spend that \$245 billion wiser than you can.

In other words, the \$12.4 trillion that Congress is going to get its hands on in

the next 7 years is not enough. They want that other 1.5 percent from you. They want that other \$245 billion so they can spend it. They do not want to save it. They want to spend it. CBO revised their numbers, updating their forecast. They say, "We believe there will be another \$135 billion." What is the first fiscal responsibility that we hear? Spend it. Spend it.

The last 3 years of our balanced budget plan calls for deficits totaling \$131 billion. If they are really serious, why don't we take that whole \$135 billion in new spending and put it directly against the deficit? We can balance this budget in 5 years, not 7, but 5 years, if we want to do that. But I have not heard anybody say that.

They are saying: Let us spend it. On top of the \$245 billion, now the President wants to, again, and the Democratic leadership wants to, again, take away from American taxpayers the \$135 billion on top of that and spend that as well.

That sends a very clear message: Tax and spend. Tax and spend. That has been the Democratic philosophy for the last 40 years, which has equated into a \$5 trillion deficit. They talk about being worried about children. We want to provide for our children. They have names and they have faces. We need to provide. But how do we provide? By robbing the piggy banks of those same children with those names and faces, so we can spend that money today on programs that we think are important?

If our children had the right to vote on this floor—if my four grandchildren could stand on this floor and vote on something that says we are going to encumber your life to the tune of \$5.5 trillion, how many votes do you think they would give us? None. None.

I am glad to hear some of the Democrats tonight say they are willing to share the blame for the shutdown of the Government tonight at midnight. They are willing to share the blame. They better have bigger shoulders than that, and they better be able to point to the very person that that blame should be on, and that is the President himself. We hear talk about being partisan, about personal attacks against the President, and that we should have more kindness on the floor.

Well, Mr. President, I am not here to be polite. I am here tonight trying to fight for the taxpayers of Minnesota and this country that sent me here. They say, "We want to be polite and compassionate, as we have for 40 years, so let us raise taxes." That has always been the easy answer.

Let us just look at it. In 1950, 2 percent of your income went to the Federal Government for taxes. So for every \$50 you made, \$1 went to Washington. It seemed to meet the needs. We were taking care of this country. We paid the debts. In fact, we paid for World War I and World War II. For Social Security, they used to take one-half of 1 percent of your incomes. That is what it used to be. Today, the Federal Gov-

ernment takes 26 percent. So, now, for every \$4 you make, you send \$1 to Washington. And Social Security has risen to over 15 percent of your income—not a half percent, but 15 percent. For your children, it is going to be 20, 25, and 30 percent, if we do not stop this growth.

So when they are saying, "This is not fair, these are not American values," I would like to know whose values they are talking about. They are not talking about my values or my fairness because I am looking at those names and those faces of the hard-working taxpayers of Minnesota, their children and their grandchildren, and I am saying I am not going to spend their inheritance into the ground so people here in Washington can pound their chest and say: "Well, I am compassionate, I have taken care of the problem. I have taken your money. Pat me on the back. Let us send out some franked mail to our constituents and say, look what we did for you, look at how good we are for you. By the way, when you look at your check stubs and fill out your taxes next April, blame it on the Republicans."

Well, everybody wants to focus on the tax cut—that \$245 billion. Let us focus on the tax cut. Boy, I will tell you, if there were two lines back in my State and one says, "Line up here to pay \$2,000 in Federal taxes, or here to pay \$1,000 in Federal taxes," I do not think there is going to be a very big decision made. I do not think anybody would be at the \$2,000 window.

We all want good Government and good services, but it does not come at any cost. There has to be some fiscal responsibility for the dollars that this Congress takes in and the dollars that this Congress spends. That is where the focus should be, not on the puny, little tax cut of \$245 billion over 7 years, when we are spending over \$12.5 trillion. They say that we better take that extra 1 percent because you are too dumb to spend it. Oh, I heard we are going to spend it at casinos if we give it to the parents. There is no such thing as a savings account, education, food, clothing, maybe a movie or a pizza; no, that is not in the realm of a smart parent. Oh, your children are not going to get that money; it is going to go to the parents and it will go to the casinos. Well, that is rhetoric, rhetoric, rhetoric.

Let us focus on the spending. How are we spending these dollars? Where are they going? There are two big things. Tax cuts is one thing they focus on, and the other is Medicare. As the Senator from Pennsylvania was saying, they want to pick on the most vulnerable and scare them and scare them. The fact of the matter is that we are very close to what the President has even proposed. When you look back at what Mrs. Clinton said in testimony before one of the committees in Congress, she said that we should hold Medicare spending to between 6 and 7 percent in order to get a handle on the

growth. That does not mean we are not going to provide the services that we need. It is not going to mean Grandma is going to be out of her wheelchair and out in the street. But she said between 6 and 7 percent. Our plan calls for a 7.2-percent growth—from \$4,800 this year to nearly \$7,200 in 7 years. They know it. They have been written up in the newspapers for demagoging Medicare. They have no shame. They continue to come and talk about it. Then they say we have to be polite and we cannot be partisan.

Personal attacks. I am not attacking individuals, I am attacking policy. This is not the right policy. Fairness, American values. How do you take more from our hard-working people and say you have to send more to Washington because we need this, we have to have more money here?

The fact again is that the President does not have a plan. The Democrats do not have a plan. We have had a balanced budget on the table for months. The President signed a pledge that said before the end of this year he would put a balanced budget on the table for 7 years scored by CBO numbers. We hate to get into calling people liars, but when we do not see the information here, I will let people draw their own conclusions of whether that pledge has been lived up to.

The Republican budget proposal that was put on the table today was different. It was a movement in the other direction. It was trying to find some common ground here. How do you find common ground when you are shadow boxing, when somebody will not come to the table and honestly put on a budget?

Then they talk about no personal attacks. I do not know if people in the gallery or people at home had a chance to watch the news tonight, but the President did not take off his gloves when he came after the Republicans and spewed more of this rhetoric. I cannot understand for the life of me how people can stand on the floor here and defend this type of action.

Talk about defense—defense is declining in actual dollars 20 percent over the next 7 years. It is not going up. Medicare is going up 53 percent; defense is going down 20 percent. Yet, they hang on to this as using this as some kind of example.

Then we have some Senator saying 80 percent of the tax cuts are going to the wealthiest in the country. Then they have others that say 50 percent is going to the wealthiest. When you pull numbers out of the air and make up stories—maybe they should go back and get the stories straight. The fact is, 80 percent of the tax reduction in this package goes to families that make less than \$100,000—not \$100,000 tax credit for someone making \$350,000. It sounds good. It is rhetoric. It might get headlines, but it is not fact. Rhetoric, half-truths, distortions.

I have been the author of the \$500-per-child tax credit and I have worked

for it for 3 years because I thought it was important that families were able to keep more of the money they made. Families out there expect this. Republicans better remember it and the Democrats should remember it because I think this is going to be one of the telling tales in the election of 1996.

I will wrap up quickly. I see the leader on the floor. Americans know why they voted for Republicans in 1994. Why are there 11 freshman Republicans in the Senate and not 1 Democrat? I think it is pretty clear. There was a clear message. Not one Republican freshman lost his seat in the House. It was pretty clear what Americans wanted. If they listened to the Republican plan, the Contract With America—you might not agree with everything in the contract—I think the majority of people in this country agree with the majority of the contract, and at least it is moving this country away from a bigger, faster growing, bloated, inefficient, money-wasting Government, to try to streamline it to make it more effective, more cost friendly for taxpayers, and to provide the better services, to provide the Medicare, to provide the welfare, to provide Medicaid, Head Start, and other programs to the kids that need it, but to also ensure that those programs are going to be here tomorrow and the next day, and the next year and the next year.

If we are going to spend their money today, if you think we are facing tough budget battles today, if we do not face this problem today, by the year 2000 this is going to be an animal that we will not want to grab the tail of because it is getting away from us now and we do not have much time to get it fixed. If we spend more money and increase the size of this Government, it will make that problem harder and harder to control. I yield the floor.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his statement. Let me indicate that we will be in session tomorrow by 11 o'clock. I do not believe there will be any votes tomorrow, but I am not certain. I cannot promise anyone. We will have meetings tomorrow morning on welfare reform on the conference report. There will be a meeting tomorrow morning on the D.C. appropriations bill. There will be debate tomorrow on the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, and we will again hopefully maybe get consent tomorrow to move to take that bill up. If that is the case, we could be considering amendments that might bring about some votes.

We will probably have to be in session late Sunday afternoon in the event there should be a CR come over from the House. That may or may not happen. It depends on whether we get back into serious discussions on the balanced budget. If that happens, I assume the House would send us a 1- or 2-day continuing resolution. That would take us through Monday or Tuesday.

I just say to my colleagues, I do not anticipate votes, but if votes should occur we will try to work out a way to give ample notice. It is pretty hard if you are on the west coast or somewhere in the western part of the United States to get back very quickly. We will try to figure out some way not to disadvantage anyone.

Let me say before I conclude, I will ask Senator BOXER have whatever time she may need when I finish.

Are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering the motion to proceed to the appropriations.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators not to exceed 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO ANDREW CHASE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I know all Senators join with me in paying tribute to Andrew Chase, who will soon be retiring from the Senate.

Andrew began his Senate career July 28, 1975, as an employee of the Sergeant at Arms' custodial service operation. In 1981, Andrew was promoted to assistant supervisor of Custodial Services and served in that position until 1988, when he accepted the position of night shift foreman for the environmental service operation.

Now, after more than 20 years of service to the Senate, Andrew is retiring to spend time with his wife, Brenda, and his remarkable family—14 children, 25 grandchildren, and 3 great grandchildren.

Andrew is also very involved in his community of Brandywine, MD, serving as president of the usher board at the Asbury United Methodist Church, and as a volunteer with the Kidney Foundation, where he visits and educates dialysis patients on kidney transplants.

On behalf of the Senate, I extend our thanks to Andrew Chase, and our best wishes for a long and happy retirement.

TRIBUTE TO DARNELL CLARENCE JACOBS, SR.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Darnell Clarence Jacobs, Sr., who will soon retire from the Senate after nearly 30 years of outstanding service.

"Jake," as he is known to his family and friends, began his Senate career in March 1966, as an employee of the Sergeant at Arms' custodial service operation.

In 1981, Jake was promoted to supervisor of custodial services, and served in that position until 1988, when he accepted a position working in the Senate Chambers.